



12.18.03.

*Library of the Theological Seminary,*  
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by *President Patton.*

BX 9947 .B35 1856  
Bartlett, Samuel Colcord,  
1817-1898.

Lectures on modern  
universalism











LECTURES

ON

# MODERN UNIVERSALISM:

AN EXPOSURE OF THE SYSTEM, FROM RECENT PUBLICATIONS  
OF ITS STANDARD AUTHORS.

BY SAMUEL C. BARTLETT, M. A.,  
MANCHESTER, N. H.



MANCHESTER, N. H.:  
FROM THE PRESS OF FISK & GAGE.  
1856.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1856, by

SAMUEL C. BARTLETT,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of New Hampshire.

# CONTENTS.

Introductory Note.	Page.
LECTURE FIRST.	
Nature and Characteristics of Universalism. . . . .	5
LECTURE SECOND.	
More Obvious Marks of Falsehood. . . . .	39
LECTURE THIRD.	
The Universalist Argument :— The Scriptures Evaded. . . .	64
LECTURE FOURTH.	
The Universalist Argument :— The Scriptures Perverted. . .	93
LECTURE FIFTH.	
The Universalist Argument :— The Scriptures Overruled. . .	135
LECTURE SIXTH.	
Moral Tendencies of Universalism. . . . .	162
LECTURE SEVENTH.	
Restorationist Views among Universalists. . . . .	197



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2009 with funding from  
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

---

THESE lectures discuss the Universalism of the present time.

The reader will observe three things : First, that the statements of doctrine are not made at second hand, but are taken directly from Universalist authors themselves, examined by the writer in person. Second, that the authors quoted are among the most noted of the denomination, men who are identified with its recent history and present condition, whose writings have had the widest circulation, and who now direct the theological literature of the order. Third, that the volumes quoted are of the most recent date, some of them not two years old, nearly all of them less than ten, and published during the life-time of their authors.

These lectures were delivered in the regular series of discourses to the writer's own congregation. Members of other congregations requested a repetition of them at a different hour, but other engagements prevented a compliance. A desire has been expressed, from various quarters, that they might be printed.

They are accordingly given to the press, in the belief that the facts they embody may help expose a system that is as full of guile as it is of error. Christians in general have no correct knowledge of *modern* Universalism. Their notions are of a Restorationism, recognizing most of the leading features of the gospel, but denying the eternity of future punishment. They have but little idea of the system which rejects nearly all the doctrines of revelation in the mass, and denies even what they regard as the foundation of common morality. They have but little conception of the artifices by which it is sustained, or the moral degradation of code which those artifices conceal. Some treatise has been needed,



which should briefly place those facts in their present aspect before the christian public. This is the principal design of these lectures. The author's own preferences would have led to a very considerable extension of the argument; but the thought that increase of size might defeat the circulation and influence of the volume, prevented. The chief thing required, after all, is to drag this system to the day-light, and strip off its disguises. To such a system, exposure is condemnation. When fairly comprehended, there is no fear but that it will be duly estimated by Christian hearts.

Another consideration, not without its influence on the author's mind, was, the possibility of reaching some of the many individuals who receive Universalism on trust. Many respectable persons in our larger places, especially many who are young and fond of pleasure, are led by their inclinations to listen to the bold and defiant assertion of a flattering doctrine, while they never have made an hour's candid examination of the subject, and have not the remotest conception of the internal rottenness of the Universalist scheme and its advocacy. The writer has the satisfaction of hearing that some such individuals were benefitted by these lectures when delivered, and he hopes that others may derive a similar benefit from their perusal. He has not deemed it necessary, for their sakes, to soften the severity of his strictures on the system as such; with the facts before them, honest men are welcome to pronounce on the propriety of the strictures. For those, who, in the full knowledge of the system, with all its windings, sophistries, palpable inconsistencies, dishonest devices and concealments, and its moral influences, yet deliberately retain it,—there is little hope in this or any other argument.

One entirely subordinate consideration in printing these lectures, was the willingness that those who have learned of their contents only through the representation of opponents, might read for themselves, and see what is the honesty of some of the public advocates of Universalism.

Modern Universalism is ashamed of itself. During the delivery of these lectures, the gross blunder and folly was first committed, of affirming that the Universalism here delineated, was that of some forty years ago. Subsequently the attempt was made, as

the writer is informed, to invalidate the testimony to facts given in 1848, by the present editor of the "Gospel Banner," (the only Universalist paper in Maine,) and by seven other persons, four of whom are recognized in the Universalist Companion for 1856, as regular Universalist preachers in Massachusetts,—with the sweeping assertion that it was the testimony of persons disfellowshipped by the denomination. Similar devices were adopted throughout.

One is often reminded of the brief interview between Lemuel Haynes and the Universalist champion brought to argue with him. When the introduction had been made and the errand stated,—“Glad to see you,” said Mr. Haynes, taking him by the hand; “well, you are the man, then, who preaches that men may swear, and lie, and get drunk, and commit adultery and all other abominations, and yet go to heaven after all, are you?” “No, no,” said the Universalist, “I do n’t preach any such thing.” “Well,” said Mr. Haynes, “*you believe so*, do n’t you?” The zeal for controversy, for once, suddenly cooled off at the question; and after a few remarks about the weather and the pleasant situation of the village, the Universalist inquired of his attendant, if it was not about “time to be going.” He felt the awkwardness of holding a doctrine which, *in its bald form*, he was ashamed to avow. Thus the most hopeful feature of the present Universalism is, that it is ashamed of itself, shrinks from the naked statements of its own doctrines, and the truthful exhibition of its own doings, and sometimes attempts, before a christian community, to repudiate the grand characteristic of the denomination for a quarter of a century, the doctrine of all its late standard treatises, and of its leading periodicals. With what success, the reader of these lectures will judge.

The Universalist books principally used for the statement of the system are the following: “The Plain Guide to Universalism,” stereotype edition, by Rev. Thomas Whittemore, now and for many years editor of the Trumpet,—a work which has circulated more widely, perhaps, than any other issued by the denomination; “A Voice to Universalists,” published in 1849, by Rev. Hosea Ballou, the patriarch of Modern Universalism; “Lecture Sermons,” third edition, 1854, by the same author; “One dozen Tracts for the People,” (Boston,) 1856, by Rev. A. C. Thomas and

Rev. T. B. Thayer, of Lowell ; "A Compend of Divinity," seventh edition, 1854, by Rev. Sylvanus Cobb, editor of the *Christian Freeman and Family Visitor* ; "Endless Punishment," published in 1847, and the "Exposition and Defence of Universalism," 1840, by Rev. I. D. Williamson, D.D., now preacher at Cincinnati and editor of the *Gospel Herald* ; and "Universalist Belief," second edition, 1846, by Rev. Asher Moore, now of New York. Other occasional references will be sufficiently indicated in their place.

These authors certainly are accredited organs of the system. They present it in its most modern and its most plausible form,—its aspect for the public. For the reader will learn before he completes these lectures, that there is also a Universalism not for the public.

On the other hand, the writer has freely availed himself of the aid of such arguments against this heresy, as have fallen in his way. He would especially acknowledge his indebtedness to the recent work of Rev. N. D. George, of the Methodist denomination, "Universalism not of the Bible." During the delivery of these lectures, he met with the volume and derived from it important information and valuable suggestions, which are cheerfully acknowledged, as well as personal courtesies from its author.

A constant difficulty which the writer has felt, has been to restrict the discussion within the limits of his design. It is hoped that any who might desire greater fulness on particular points, will remember the object in view. In wading through the dreary mass of sophistry over which he has passed, it has been difficult always to repress his disgust, and he has not always succeeded.

The lectures are printed almost precisely as they were delivered, with only a simple revision of the style, and the insertion of portions omitted for want of time. They must be given to the press so, or not at all. They are published, not for literary purposes, but to do good. May the blessing of the Lord Jesus Christ accompany them.

Manchester, N. H., August, 1856.

# LECTURES ON MODERN UNIVERSALISM.

---

## LECTURE FIRST.

### THE NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SYSTEM.

2 Corinthians, XI: 13, 14, 15. For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel: for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness.

SUCH is the assertion distinctly made by Christ's apostle, concerning certain teachers then living and teaching among the Corinthian Christians, and claiming to be teachers and even apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ. Of course they were very indignant at the charge. It does not appear, however, that any disaster to Christ's cause resulted from what timid men must have thought a very imprudent speech of the apostle. Doubtless that cause was advanced, when the issue was distinctly made and Satan's doctrine bore its proper name.

We learn from this statement of Paul, that it is no unheard-of thing for systems of religion to claim the name of Christianity—Christianity of the highest or-

der—while they are but doctrines of devils ; and that men may claim, and some have claimed to be apostles of Christ and ministers of righteousness, when in fact they are false apostles and ministers of Satan. It also appears to be an apostolic practice to refute prevailing errors that stand opposed to the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. Whole epistles, and large portions of all the epistles, are devoted to the overthrow of heresies.

Various indications have led me to think it high time that evangelical Christians in this community should have a better understanding of the system that is called Universalism. I propose therefore to discuss the subject in several discourses.

The present discourse will consider the Nature and Characteristics of Modern Universalism.

I. THE NATURE OF THE SYSTEM. I speak of the system, not of men. There may be many connected with it who do not fully imbibe the system, nor bring forth its legitimate fruits. There are many highly moral and reputable men who profess to receive it. They are requested to remember the admission. There are a few preachers, prominent men, ranked under its banners, who chiefly moralize gravely or showily upon the varied aspects of human life and character, while they remain singularly silent on the fundamental tenet of the system, and singularly abstemious from the general strain of its preaching. There have been a very few individuals in other denominations, who, like John Foster, have held all the fundamental doctrines of orthodoxy as the broad platform of their belief, and yet have had speculative *questionings* on the eternity of future punishment, questionings which they have rath-

er wished than been able to confirm, and which they have held as mere incidental things; between whom and the men that are forever rolling over the doctrine of universal salvation as the whole gospel of Christ, the difference is so immense that they cannot be included in the same description,—notwithstanding the constant efforts of Universalism to gain the respectability of their names.

I speak of the system that is embodied in the doctrinal writings of the modern Universalist denomination, and heard weekly from the vast majority of its pulpits. The statement shall be made from their own ablest writers, examined by myself in their own works; such men as Hosea Ballou, A. C. Thomas, T. B. Thayer, Thomas Whittemore, Sylvanus Cobb, I. D. Williamson. It is the system which is spread before the denomination by the editors of “The Trumpet,” “The Universalist Quarterly Review,” “The Christian Freeman,” and “The Gospel Herald.”

It is not the Universalism even of one-half a century ago, that I am to discuss; but Modern Universalism, that of the last few years, of the present time.\*

Now most Christians, I think, suppose that system to be the same that it was fifty years ago; and its advocates are not always anxious to dispel the illusion. But an illusion it is, Hosea Ballou himself being witness. “As this doctrine was first taught in this country,” says he,† “its general aspect indicated that it had what we may call a Calvinistic base. It does not appear that

---

\*For the date of the authorities cited, see Introductory Note.

†Voice to Un. pp. 28, 29.



our earliest Universalists doubted that man by sin had incurred the just penalty of endless punishment, but fully relied on the efficacy of the atonement for a deliverance of all men from such a condition. The doctrine of the Trinity was also held as an essential part of the general system of doctrine." These and other connected doctrines, he calls "exploded superstitions," and informs us\* of the "sharp conflict" which formerly took place between the older preachers who retained them and the younger brethren who repudiated them, and which at one time threatened "lamentable consequences," but ended in the final rejection of the doctrines. The earlier Universalists were Restorationists, holding to a limited future retribution; "the doctrine of a future retribution," says Ballou,† "was not denied by any of the early defenders of final restoration." But the denomination long since repudiated the doctrine from its public teachings, and with it, the last remnants of orthodoxy that clung to it. The entire theology of the denomination is now moulded by its one absorbing principle; and that principle,

The grand characteristic doctrine of Modern Universalism, is, *that all men alike, when they die, (or when they come to consciousness after death,) enter on eternal blessedness.*

The great apostle of Modern Universalism, Hosea Ballou, in 1849 informs us that "for nearly forty years," he had not believed in any future punishment. And he gives the following piece of testimony, which, as

---

\*Id., p. 36. †Ib.



coming from a man who had then been sixty years in the Universalist ministry, and was thoroughly conversant with the affairs of the denomination, is of the very highest authority: "though there are some now who believe in what is called future retribution, *we know of none who pretend to prove it by divine revelation, or dwell on it in their preaching.* We know of no passages of scripture, which teach the doctrine of a future state, which imply the existence of either sin or punishment in that state. Could we find any such testimony, we should then need scripture proof that such sin and punishment will have an end, in order to be consistent Universalists." Such is the weighty testimony of the patriarch of the system, near the close of his course.\*

In perfect harmony with this testimony are the published opinions of their leading writers.

Whittemore, for a quarter of a century identified with "The Trumpet," and with Universalism in New England, writes thus: "Now to say that man shall sin on the earth, and suffer the recompense in some other state of being, is alike reasonable with saying that a man who sows a field of grain in Massachusetts, shall reap the harvest in some other state;"† and, "no threatening or law extends sin or its consequences beyond the resurrection."‡

Rev. I. D. Williamson, D.D., now editor of the "Gospel Herald," declares as the belief of the denomination, that "all the evil passions that distract and

---

\* In the year 1849, "Voice to Un.," p. 37. † Plain Guide, p. 265.

‡ Id., p. 34.

torment men on earth, will be left in the earth where they originated," and "the future life shall be to all a ceaseless blessing."\*

Rev. Hosea Ballou informs us that "the apostle [Paul] did not believe in a state of sin and misery after the resurrection;"† that "we are certified that all that die live unto God in the resurrection, and are children of God, equal to angels, and can die no more."‡ He also asserts, "It is plain from the scriptures that all sin, all wickedness, and all evil doings are the works of the flesh; and there appears no more reason for supposing that the effects of these works are to extend into the immortal state, than for supposing that the effects of wholesome or unwholesome food are to extend to that state."§

Rev. Sylvanus Cobb, editor of the "Christian Freeman," asserts that "the resurrection state is, without any limitation or reserve, as the state of the angels, of God in heaven;" there is "no room for the notion that there will be an immortal state, in which men will continue in sin and shame." He says, "Jesus Christ and his apostles urge the doctrine of suitable rewards and punishments pending the conduct of men; but they never give out the idea, that a future immortal state of existence is either to be bought or sold by the doings of men in time."¶ Rev. A. C. Thomas, in "Tract" No. 5, fully sets forth the same doctrine.

Says Rev. Asher Moore, "We therefore conclude that the punishment for sins is in the same state of being where men transgress the law of God."\*\*\*

---

\* Exposition, pp. 18, 19. † Lecture Sermons, p. 86. ‡ Id., p. 329. § Id., p. 335. ¶ Compend of Divinity, pp. 317, 318. \*\*\* Un. Belief, p. 177.

Says Rev. O. A. Skinner, "So far as admission to endless glory is concerned, the saint and sinner stand on a perfect level."\*

In full conformity to these views, Rev. A. B. Grosh, editor of the "Universalist Companion," writes in 1856, "God has established his judgment in the earth, where it is needed—*where differences exist—where men sin*—where they should be called to account, tried and punished. God's judgment is in the earth. In the earth men are rewarded;" "the scriptures never speak of men going out of this life, or leaving this earth to go to judgment, but always of God and Christ coming to the earth to judge men." He affirms that "Christ is *now* judging every man according to his works," and that Christ's kingdom, the kingdom of heaven, spoken of in the scriptures, is on the earth alone.†

Not to multiply quotations, hear the statement made by Rev. N. D. George, of the Methodist denomination in his recent work on Universalism: "We have in our possession a large number of books, sermons and tracts from their ablest ministers, and in them all there is not a single effort to teach future rewards and punishments; but on the other hand the doctrine is uniformly combatted by those authors, and the future-state reference of those texts which Restorationists formerly employed to teach future punishments, is denied. We called a short time since at the Universalist book-store in Boston, and inquired if there was any book on sale

---

\*Universalism Illustrated and Defended, p. 266. Quoted from Rev. N. D. George's "Universalism not of the Bible," p. 231.

†Un. Com. for 1856, pp. 16, 17, 18, 19.

in which future punishment is taught, or if any one in the denomination had issued such a book. The man in attendance said he knew of no such book issued among them. Their approved Catechisms, used in their Sabbath Schools, do not teach it. They are before us by Balch, Bacon, Skinner, Adams, and S. R. Smith, not one of which even intimates that there is anything to be dreaded by the sinner in the future world.”\*

We are occasionally told that there are some in the denomination, who believe in limited future punishment. But the men who unequivocally dwell upon it in their teaching or their preaching are not easily to be found. In 1841, Mr. Balfour testified that though he had been twenty years in the denomination, “he never heard it preached but once, and the preacher hardly said enough about it to let his hearers understand that he believed this doctrine.”† If there are those who believe it, they do not teach it. And when you ask who believes it, it is somebody else. Whittemore says there are some who believe it, but he is not one. Moore and Williamson imply the same; but they are not the men. Ballou speaks of some; but he is not one. And what is more, in 1849, he knew no man who did dwell upon it in his preaching. Nor could book or tract be heard of at the Universalist book-store in the metropolis of New England, in which future punishment is taught.‡

---

\*P. 382. This work of Mr. George was published the present year; it is a work of wide research and deserves a wide circulation.

†Quoted from the Christian Messenger, July 17, 1841, in M. H. Smith's "Un. Examined," p. 217.

‡When hard pressed by argument, Universalists sometimes avow

I fortify this point with copious proof, because this is the very Universalism on which I propose to lecture, the doctrine which denies all future punishment. It is the characteristic doctrine of Modern Universalism, that all men alike are raised to blessedness and glory.\*

To this, all else is shaped. In truth, all else is of very little separate account, being only and obviously the scaffolding of this one all-absorbing theme. To

---

Restorationist doctrines. A popular preacher not long since was understood by intelligent hearers to avow the Restorationist view. But I had heard the same man, not three months previous, publicly endorse the sentiment that a young man who died impenitent, and, as the story went, was consigned to the world of woe by the Orthodox funeral sermon, was actually in heaven at the time of a second funeral sermon, preached by a Universalist at the father's request.

\*It is a common thing for members of the denomination to convey the impression that Restorationist views are widely prevalent among them; and I find that many of my brethren have supposed it to be so. But where is the evidence in book or treatise? Where is the Universalist pulpit in which the doctrine is openly taught and enforced? Where has the Universalist funeral sermon been heard, in which it was not expressed or implied that the deceased, whatever his character, had gone straight to heaven?

I do not question that individual preachers—I know not how many—may privately hold, but I am very confident they do not publicly *teach and promulgate* Restorationism. If there are such men, it is still true of them as in Nov. 1844, when Rev. Mr. Drew, (then editor of the Banner, now Professor in the Tuft's Universalist College,) said of them in the Banner, "Their desire for the peace of the order, has caused them to be more careful than some of different views have been, as to committing the order to their opinions." They have been careful indeed;—"the order" is nowhere committed to their opinions—it is everywhere, so far as one can learn, "committed to the doctrine of no future punishment."

Probably no evangelical writer has more thoroughly investigated their views than Rev. N. D. George, and his testimony is as follows: "For twenty years past, I have been a close observer of the modifications, tactics, and general operations of the order of Universalists, and having availed myself of their periodicals and books, by their principal men, I

show, however, how thorough-going is the system in rejecting all that Evangelical Christianity receives, and lest any should imagine it only an incidental difference of systems otherwise alike, I add some of the subordinate lineaments. The leading writers to whom I have referred, are bold and open in denying the Trinity, and, of course, the Supreme Divinity of Christ.\*

They reject with scorn and even mockery the doctrine of a Vicarious Atonement. Moore pronounces it "a mere medley of injustice, contradiction and absurdity, — preposterous and shocking to all the moral sensibility of our nature."† The doctrine, Williamson says, is "unjust in theory, impossible in fact, and pernicious in practice."‡ Ballou, Cobb, and others are equally outspoken.

The system denies the existence of a personal Devil;§ the fall of man, the entire innocence of the first pair, and the entire moral delinquency of their descendants.||

---

am fully satisfied that, whatever a few of its advocates may profess in certain localities, *no future punishment* is the doctrine of the Universalist body in the United States, the exceptions being very few. There is but little regard among them for the future punishment views of the Restorationists. The force of their teachings for years, has been against them." Un. not of the Bible, preface, p. 6.

\*Ballou's Voice, p. 32; Cobb's Compend, p. 169 and onward; Williamson's Exposition, p. 23, etc.

† Pp. 133, 135. ‡ Ex., p. 44. § Voice, p. 33. "Lect. Sermon," p. 73.

|| "There is no other way to account for the first transgression than by admitting a constitutional imperfection in the agent." Lecture Sermons, p. 65. "There appears no authority for the common opinion that the first transgression produced a radical change in the moral constitution of man, or in consequence of the first sin man became totally depraved and altogether opposed to all good, and inclined wholly to all evil." Ib., p. 73. See, also, Cobb, p. 423; Moore, p. 91.



It pronounces the scripture narrative of the Temptation an allegory.\* It denies that the present life is a state of probation; † that there is a resurrection of the human body; ‡ and that there is a judgment and retribution after death.§

While abundantly using the word "forgiveness," the system most emphatically denies that God ever does forgive, in the sense of *remitting the penalty of sin*; but holds that all sin receives all the chastisement it deserves. "Set it down," says Williamson, "as one of the peculiar doctrines of Universalism that no man can by any possibility escape a just punishment for his sins. We believe in the forgiveness or removal of sin, *not* in the remission of *punishment*, and neither forgiveness, nor atonement, nor repentance, nor any thing else can step in between the sinner and the penalty of the violated law."|| "We maintain," says Moore, "that God never swerves from strict justice in his dealings with mankind, but certainly renders unto all the full recompense of their doings."¶

After making much ado over the absolute certainty of punishment which it teaches, the system proceeds deliberately to destroy all its influence by confining that

\*Lecture Sermons, p. 67.

†Plain Guide, p. 271; Exposition, p. 96; Compend., pp. 65, 115, 267, etc.; Un. Belief, p. 179.

‡Compend., 359.

§Exposition, p. 115; Compend. pp. 112, etc.; Lecture Sermons, pp. 269, etc., 334, etc.; Voice, pp. 46, 89.

||Exposition, p. 15.

¶Universalist Belief, p. 159. See also Cobb, pp. 67, 72, 155.; Bal-ou, Lecture Sermons, p. 157, etc.



punishment to the present life,\* and limiting it to the *present natural consequences of our actions*.† Pretending to threaten the sinner with certain punishment, it tells him in the same breath “your punishment is only what you are having now;” and he goes his way in quiet, for he did not know before that he was in the act of being punished.

Still further to remove a sense of the ill-desert and enormity of sin, the system declares that even punishment is never the mark of God’s displeasure towards sinners, but always a loving remedy for a disease; — a “mark of parental solicitude and affection;”‡ — and that in fact God loves all men, saint and sinner, alike and with an equal love. And thus, while the scripture informs us that God “hates all workers of iniquity,” that he “will render indignation and wrath” to evil doers, that “his anger is not turned away,” that

\* Plain Guide, pp. 163, 164, 165. Lect. Sermon, pp. 157, 335, 262. Un. Belief, 176, 172.

† “If man transgress the law, its penalty is unavoidable, and is *comprised in the evils in which the transgression involves them*. Cobb’s Compend, p. 67. “When and where are you to receive the punishment of your sins? We answer the question and say, sin and misery are inseparably united in the nature of cause and effect. When and where we are sinful, then and there are we our own tormentors.” Lect. Sermon. p. 157. “Here we have a clear understanding of the Divine Government by rewards and punishments. Any compliance with moral duty brings a corresponding enjoyment; any departure from moral duty is a corresponding discount on our happiness.” Voice to Un. p. 68. The subject is pursued at length by these writers.

‡ This position, as a fundamental feature of Universalism, runs through their writings, expressly or by implication. It is stated at length in Williamson’s chapter on “Punishments,” Moore’s chapter on “Rewards and Punishments,” and other places. This view, therefore, while retaining the word, rejects the idea, and *denies the fact of punishment proper*.

“he was turned to be their enemy,”—and is sprinkled on almost every page with the like declarations, we hear Rev. Hosea Ballou coolly assuring us, in the last edition of his *Lecture Sermons*, that “the sinner is equally the object of divine love as the righteous”—that “Adam was equally the object of divine favor after he sinned as before”—that “the opinion that our heavenly Father became inimical to man in consequence of his sin, is repugnant to the essential character of the Divine Being”—and that “neither sin nor any thing else was ever the cause of enmity in God towards man”; and Williamson declaring it “an unquestionable truth, that God does not hate any thing that he has made.”\* Nay, so high is the audacity and so low the moral standard of these writers, that the one of them informs us that “if sin were more conducive to human happiness than virtue, it would not be right [in God] to prohibit its practice”; and the other declares that “if there were in nature any thing more calculated to happify mankind than is the divine Being, that thing would certainly have the greatest claim on our love.”†

Having gone thus far, it became further necessary to deny all fundamental difference of human character, and any such radical change as Christians mean by regeneration; and accordingly we find Mr. Whittemore denying that the scripture recognizes “two classes of

---

\* Ballou's *Lect. Sermon*. pp. 25, 152, 309. Williamson's *Endless Pun.* Ex. p. 42. See the same doctrine in Williamson's *Exposit.* p. 72-3; Moore's *Un. Bel.* p. 93. See also a singular *Essay* by H. Ballou, Sen., on “The Utility of Evil,” in which the dubious nature of the title is by no means alleviated in the discussion.

† *Exposit.*, p. 66; *Lecture Sermons*, p. 206.

men, the righteous and the wicked," either in this life or at the resurrection,—the same man while doing righteously is "the righteous," and wickedly "the wicked"—that is all.\* Mr. Ballou cautiously but emphatically endorses the sentiment.† The latter writer also declares that "the church which Jesus loved," "consists of every man or the whole human family;" while the former artfully but distinctly argues for abolishing the distinction between church and congregation, and having the whole audience join in observing the Lord's Supper.‡

The views of God's government taught by the system would of course render all prayer unavailing; but christian decency forbids to dispense with prayer. Accordingly, while here and there an individual, (like Mr. Grosh, of Utica, and Robert Smith, then of Hartford,) have publicly disavowed the practice, the highest view taught upon the subject is that of those who hold that it may produce an effect on us but not on God;§ while not one of them teaches that either prayer, or repentance, or faith, or our conduct in any shape or form, has the slightest effect on our condition hereafter. "The truth is," says Williamson, "man can by his faith and works do something towards meliorating his

\* Plain Guide, pp. 264, 265.

† Lecture Sermons, pp. 263, 264, 337. The writer endeavors to blur his statement by occasionally using the phrases "exclusively righteous" and "exclusively wicked," but his meaning is transparent; he denies any distinctive element in the one that is not in the other, that is, any radical difference of character among men.

‡ Lecture Sermons, p. 209. Plain Guide, p. 332.

§ Skinner and others, quoted by N. D. George, p. 295.

condition here ; but he cannot procure his resurrection from the dead ; and if he cannot procure the thing itself, much less can he procure any modification of it. *All* that man is and all that he *can* be in the resurrection he must owe to God alone ; his feeble works cannot reach one line beyond the grave.” “ If man’s resurrection from the dead depends wholly on God, and no human power can effect it, so must the state and condition of man equally depend on God, and be equally beyond the reach of human agency.”\* Jesus Christ and his Apostles,” says Mr. Cobb, “ urge the doctrine of suitable rewards and punishments, pending the conduct of men ; but they never give out the idea that a future immortal state of existence is either to be bought or sold by the doings of men in time.”† “ There appears,” says Ballou, “ no more reason for supposing that the effects of these works [the works of the flesh] are to extend into the immortal state, than for supposing that the effects of wholesome or unwholesome food are to extend to that state.”‡

The system also teaches that *Christ*, though called a Savior with most abundant phrase, *saves from nothing beyond this life*. “ The evils from which Jesus came to save men,” says Whittemore, “ are in this world ; and for this reason he came into this world to save them.”§ “ The common doctrine,” says Ballou, “ which teaches us that Christ Jesus came into *this*

---

\* Exposition, pp. 167, 168. The same statement is made in Tract No. 5, by Rev. A. C. Thomas, of Philadelphia.

† Compend. p. 318.

‡ Lecture Sermons, p. 335.

§ Plain Guide, p. 234.

*world* to save us in *another world*, is contrary to all the representations which are found in the scriptures.”\* He saves men in this world from ignorance, superstition and fear, by revealing a future life of blessedness; it is also added for the sake of appearances, he saves men from sin;—but how, the system has never clearly demonstrated either in theory or in practice.

As for the institution of a Church and the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper, the editor of the Universalist Expositor (whom Mr. Whittemore quotes with a general endorsement) admits that they are discarded in practice by more than two-thirds of their congregations; and adds for himself, “we have doubts of the existence of ordinances in Christianity; we mean in the usual technical sense of the term.”||

Of the views which extensively prevail in the denomination concerning the Holy Scriptures, I must defer speaking until a future occasion.

I have given a rapid sketch of the main features of the system. But after all, the great theme, the grand burden of the system, is the doctrine of all men’s salvation. This is the fore-front of it—the beginning, the middle, and the end. It is the sum and substance of the gospel—the glad tidings of great joy. For this the whole Bible is racked, and every doctrine it teaches, wrenched, and hammered, and clipped. It is, in some form, the perpetual theme of the Universalist preacher, it is the ceaseless want of the hearer, it is the sole, yea, let me say, the forlorn hope of the Uni-

---

\* Lecture Sermons, p. 17.

|| Plain Guide, pp. 424, 326.

versalist's heart. In proof that I do not speak too strongly, listen to their own statements. Says Mr. Williamson, "This is with us the crowning excellence of the gospel—a theme on which we ever dwell, with the most lively satisfaction and joy. To this grand consummation of the Divine government, all the attributes of God and all the principles of the Divine government are tending."\* Says Mr. Whittemore, it "is the central sun of Universalism. This with them [Universalists] is the all absorbing topic; the crowning excellence of revealed religion; the richest glory of God; the highest honor of Christ; the fullest joy of saints; the sweetest answer to prayer; the strongest motive to praise; the most potent charm of christian faith; a fountain of consolation in life; a holy triumph in death; the joy of angels and of the spirits of just men made perfect. Such is *the doctrine of the ultimate salvation of all the human race.*"†

But enough. The doctrine of universal salvation is, by their own showing, the "all-absorbing" feature of the system:—and that, too, the immediate blessedness of all men at the resurrection—a blessedness *with which neither their conduct nor Christ's work has any thing to do.*‡ So far as evidence appears and according to the recent testimony of its late patriarch, no other doctrine is now publicly and emphatically pro-

---

\* Exposition, p. 18.

† Plain Guide, p. 18.

‡ How it comes to pass, I have not attempted to state, because it is left indistinct by their writers. A view sometimes stated and apparently oftener implied is that "as the present life is the simple gift of God, so will be a future life of blessedness."



mulgated than this: that every man, however vile and loathsome, is raised from the dead to enter at once on perfect and eternal bliss. That is the nature, and that the central sun of Modern Universalism.

I have laid before you, as briefly as was consistent with the proof of my statements, the creed which—with occasional deviations—veiled by many a circuitous phrase and orthodox term, covered by many a feint, and sometimes, as we have seen, denied or retracted in pure shame at its naked deformity, yet underlies and pervades the preaching, the books, the periodicals, of the Universalist denomination—taught by its great names, spread through its weekly sheets.

Behold the system. And before proceeding to refute its teachings, let us gaze a little on its monstrous features at our leisure, as we proceed to consider

## II. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF MODERN UNIVERSALISM.

1. This system is, in every practical aspect, solely an earthly system.

Its aim is earthly. Its sole aim is to make men happy in this world. Do not understand this as a figure of speech—it is simply the literal fact. Universalism tells men, indeed, that they shall be blessed hereafter; but that is only in order to make this life pleasant and to take away its gloom. All it professes *to do* for man is confined to this world. It is to make no difference with the future. Universalism does not offer one shred of information, one fragment of advice, one caution, or suggestion, or hint—not one—that has the shadow of a practical influence on our condition in the life to come. It does not pretend to do it. It



distinctly avows that it cannot do it. It does not say, "do this and it shall be the better for you in another world;" but, "do it or not, be holy or vile, Christ-like or devilish, you shall be happy alike. Believe the statement or not,—do what you can to defeat it,—you shall still be happy in spite of yourself." Not one thing of all its swelling words and boisterous proclamations is to have the influence of a feather's weight, on man's condition through all that portion of his being to which this whole life is the first beat of an eternal pulse. It stands up in the pulpit Sabbath after Sabbath, and pretends to teach religion, to utter a communication from the eternal God to his immortal creatures; and yet, not one word it utters is to affect, in the slightest degree, that creature's *immortality*—it shall not, cannot modify one hair's breadth that creature's character or destiny throughout all eternity. *It openly snaps all connection between a future life and this*, and preaches to him a message that concerns him only while he is among the beasts that perish. And this is preaching! This is a religion! This is a message, and all the message from the God of Heaven!—a message to immortal man, having no practical bearing on his immortality!

And this is not all. It is of the earth in its origin and all its special doctrines. It contains not a teaching that breathes of any higher original than the soul of sinning man. Its whole effort, the burden of its teaching and its preaching, is to bring the entire character and requirements of the great God, down to the standard of his fallen creatures. The system is a mere naturalism, and the naturalism of a sinner. Its per-

petual strain in regard to God and his character is that he will not do so and so, because a human father would not do so. Its grand and ceaseless argument against eternal punishment, which sticks out through every disguise, is that it cannot be true because it is so horrible and so shocking to the sensibilities of weak, sinful man. God is, in his moral character, little more than a magnified Universalist. And in his speech he is represented as, like the lowest order of men, in constant habits of monstrous exaggeration.

Sin against God is not the thing that "God hates," an "abomination" unto him; it in express and open words denies that sin is an infinite evil,\* or that God hates the workers of iniquity; it is a thing that a little earthly suffering fully remedies. It studiously toils, as the groundwork of all its pretensions, to inculcate the lowest earthly view of sin and of holiness—to make them just what sinful men deem them and no more. And thus its doctrine of reward and punishment is equally low and earthly; it is nothing but the law of natural cause and effect, open to the eye of every man: vice produces unhappiness; and for obedience, says Ballou, "there is no extraneous reward,"—"the reward is the deed,—the reward is the obedience itself."† And to make this earthly view tenfold more earthly, it arrests the action of the cause, and violently breaks it off at the hour of death, so as to reduce it to its lowest conceivable compass. And for this natural result here on earth, it offers no alleviation. "Set it down as one of the peculiar doctrines of

---

\* Voice to Un., p, 33.

† Id. p. 93.

Universalism, that no man can by any possibility escape the just punishment of his sins.”\* There is no amelioration of that, with Christ or without him ; while neither Christ’s work, nor man’s conduct, has any effect on the future state. And thus the mission of Christ is vacated of all that is heavenly. And though he is called a Savior and the word Salvation is abundant enough—they are mere words for effect—they are void words, by their own showing. He saves from none of the punishment due to sin in this life,—that can by no possibility be escaped, say they. He saves from no punishment hereafter—endless punishment, say they, is in the nature of things impossible with God. He casts no light on the present punishment of sin ; men know that themselves. And though it is affirmed that he came to save men from their superstition, and their fears of the future, yet he brought no new light. For it is one of the most strenuous of all the Universalist teachings, that both the reason of man and the book of nature prove, beyond all possibility, of contradiction, that God is love and could not inflict eternal punishment. But, we are told, “He saves, also, from sin.” How, I ask ? The only answer is, “by precept and example,” that is, in the *common earthly* way, just like any other good man. And we will cheerfully accord all proper credit to the system for these words which it sometimes parades as a feint to cover its actual line of march, when we can learn of the first human being who has been saved from the practice and the love of sin by embracing Universalism.

---

\* Williamson’s Exp., p., 15.

Thus there is not an important feature of the system but is human and earthly in character. None of its characteristic teachings rise above a man-made creed ; and it gives man nothing whatever to do, or think, or feel, that can exert the least effect beyond this world.

Earthly in its origin, teaching and tendency, it is ever dear to those whose heart is bound up in this Earth. Many such men have confessed, that while burrowing like the blind mole in earthly things, they would have been glad, and they tried hard, to believe the doctrine and to comfort themselves with it in their low career ;—but common sense, and conscience, and the word of God barred their way. Yet many do succeed. Many deeply, thoroughly worldly men, determined that they will live only for this present life, do quiet themselves with the belief that this life has no influence on the life to come. They hold so, because they will have it so ;—and though the word of God, or an angel of God with a drawn sword stood in the way,—yea, though God himself with the sword of justice does stand athwart the way, they will go on. They live, they *will* live for earth,—they will have a doctrine of earth.

Many, resolved to plunge in all manner of illicit, reckless pleasure, are determined they will not be disturbed by any forebodings of future woe ; and they know well—they need not my voice to tell them, how it came nor why it is that they cleave to that syren song, “ ye shall not surely die.” They know it is not from prayerful study nor even laborious examination of God’s word, nor from thoughtful reflection of any

kind—they have no intelligent knowledge on the subject—but because *it is* an earthly doctrine,—and because it does divorce their chosen course in this life so absolutely from all consequences hereafter. They know that thing. Yea, the Sabbath breaker loves it. The great swindler proclaims it as his solace;\* the petty swindler makes it his. The blasphemer swears out the praises of its preachers. They love it in grogshops—the motley throng there swallow it down as greedily as they do that other delirious draught that fills their glass and leads them down to hell. How many a man attempts to drown his temporal and his eternal woe in the same maddening cup. It is wholly a doctrine of the earth—of the clods.

2. This system is in its moral tone low and groveling. I cannot conceive of anything much lower. Under the name of Christianity and the pretence of honoring the Bible, and with pretexts of more or less speciousness, it actually pushes the moral relations of human existence lower than almost any known system of belief. Its views of human life, of God, of sin, of man's relation to God, are in important respects on a plane of moral degradation below most forms of Heathenism. Nay, where is the system of Heathenism on God's earth, that cuts off every bond and fibre of moral connection between this life and the life to come. Every other form of Heathenism that holds to another state of being, holds to some bearing of our moral conduct here on our destiny hereafter; that, at least, as to-day influences to-morrow, so this day of life

---

\* Barnum's Auto-Biography, p. 247.

shapes the morrow of eternity ; that the warp threads of human existence are strung here, and run on to receive the woof beyond. But this system runs its shears abruptly along and *cuts every thread*, and leaves this life dangling loose and aimless in the wind. Heathenism never sunk so low. It is vain to evade by saying that this life is a state of discipline ; for the system distinctly denies that the discipline of this life has the slightest influence on our condition hereafter ; its whole force is spent here, often to no purpose ; whereas John and Judas alike leave all sin and suffering behind them in the grave.

Its views of sin, also, are low. It entertains the grossest pagan view, that sin is only an evil of such a kind, that a little bodily pain or a little mental remorse may make all right again. The fact of pain and suffering here, so crowds itself on men's observation that it cannot be denied — otherwise, all punishment would probably be held inconsistent with God's love. And it is lower than Heathenism in its estimate of sin's ill-desert ; for it holds that no sin, not even that of him who commits murder and suicide in the same minute, deserves or receives *any* chastisement hereafter. If there be any form of Paganism in ancient or modern times, in Scandinavia, or in Africa, holding so low a view of the evil of sin, I am not aware of it.

Equally low is its moral tone in regard to God. God is substantially a mere instrument for making men happy. "God is love," is its ever recurring phrase ; and as Satan came quoting scripture, transformed into an angel of light, so this system under pretence of exalting God's love, tramples down all those grand



moral qualities which form his everlasting glory ; it sets its hoof on the holiness that is the brightness of his crown, and its cloven foot on the “justice and the judgment,” that are “the habitation of his throne.” His judgment—even his ultimate moral discernment between the righteous and the wicked—it sets aside, when it affirms that after death the saints of the earth and they that go down foul and rotten with corruption shall rush alike into God’s loving arms. His justice it speaks of, but that is a word, and no more ; it means but the action of certain natural laws on earth, which visit their own violation with pain—and that pain, not as an expression of God’s displeasure but as the means of restoring the transgressor’s happiness. And as to any such trait as ultimate and changeless holiness in God, I find no trace of it in the system. The word may be there—though of the seldomest—but the thing seems to be wanting. God is a very glorious being whose chief function is to make all men happy ; that is his use. Rev. I. D. Williamson, showing the reason why God has any right to punish sin, namely, because it is “productive of evil to man,” [of course in this life,] uses these remarkable and significant words : “for if *sin were more conducive to human happiness than virtue*, it would not be right to prohibit its practice.”\* That is so say, all notion of moral excellence, or moral character, or holiness in the great God himself, is over-ridden and crushed out by this grand function and everlasting obligation to make even the vilest of beings happy. God is the mere tool and

---

\* Exposition, p. 66.

servant of reckless transgressors! And thus, whatever moral precepts it may utter in detail, it cuts them all up together by the root, when it teaches that God loves all men alike in this world, and will treat all men alike in the next. If there is a more grovelling notion of God's moral character and functions to be found in the annals of human degradation — tell me, oh! tell me, where shall I find it!

Its moral tone suffers then in many respects, when compared with Heathenism. Not only so, but even when compared with other forms of infidelity. Infidelity has generally contented itself with being let alone in another world; *that* is all it has dared to ask. The most it looked for, has been that man should shift for himself, and God be indifferent. But Universalism goes further than that and offers a God that shall and must make them happy at all events, do what they will to earn misery. Infidelity has only said in its vile carousings, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Nay, says Universalism, eat, drink and be merry, O drunkard, and adulterer, and gambler, and thief, and wretch of every shade and dye, for to-morrow ye go to heaven." And its literal teaching in regard to the filthy Canaanites, and the vile Sodomites, if it admit the scripture account, has been truly versified thus :

" God saw those villians were too bad  
To own that fruitful land ;  
And so he took the wretches up,  
To dwell at his right hand."

"Death is a sleep," was the most that those awful Revolutionists in the midst of their crimes, dared



inscribe over the tomb. But if Modern Universalism had been there, she would have said to those benighted beings thus living below their privileges, "O woman, rushing from the world—reeking with all vice and pollution; O man, dripping with the blood of murder, and of suicide, soar now to glory and to perfect bliss, and the loving embrace of God!" Yea, of Judas himself, it is the literal doctrine of Modern Universalism, if it grant his suicide, —

"He by a cord outwent his Lord  
And got to heaven first."

And thus it is a system whose strength lies not in scripture, nor in reason, nor in conscience, but in depravity; in the desires of a wicked life, or at least an impenitent heart. None has occasion to crave the doctrine but he who is determined not to repent; no man has occasion to build his hopes there, but he who refuses to obey the claims of Christ in the gospel. It has human depravity strong on its side; and that is all.

And this leads me to remark,

3. The system is, in doctrine and spirit, in irreconcilable antagonism to Evangelical Christianity.

Few men, I believe, take broader grounds of christian fellowship, than I do. Every church that holds the central truths of the gospel, I recognize as a Christian Church, however widely it may deviate from my own preferences. But here is a system, which, on every important point relating to God, his character, his government, his plans, his principles, to man, his nature and deserts, his destiny, Christ and his work, sin and its punishment, affirms what we deny, and

denies what we affirm. We maintain that God exists and acts primarily for his own glory ; that his holiness is his chief glory ; that he hates sin on its own account and is angry with sinners ; that sin is an infinite evil ; that this life is a state of probation ; that all men are sinners and deserve only God's vengeance ; that it is only through Christ's atonement that even the Christian is saved ; but that the penalty of sin is actually remitted to the Christian for Christ's sake ; that no man will be saved as matter of justice ; that faith and repentance here are essential to blessedness hereafter, that they who have them not shall suffer endlessly ;—all which vital points and many others Universalism denies. It affirms that God has the same kind of love to every human being ; that his only function is to make his creation happy ; that he inflicts pain only for the sake of making the individual sinner happy ; that he has no right to inflict it for any other purpose ; that the influence of repentance, faith and Christ's teaching are confined to this life ; that every man will be happy hereafter as matter of course ; that sin is not an infinite evil, it is a very limited evil, and its only bad quality is that it makes men unhappy here ;—and many the like things which we utterly deny. In a word we affirm, that literally *everything* in our destiny beyond the grave depends on our conduct here ; Universalism, literally and absolutely *nothing*. Can there be a more utter antagonism ? And even in those points where there may be a seeming correspondence—a correspondence of words—the antagonism beneath is equally great. We say God “forgives,” meaning that he remits the penalty of sin ; Universalism uses the

word, but totally denies the thing. We speak of God's "mercy," and his grace, meaning his goodness to the undeserving and the ill-deserving; that system uses the words, but knows no such fact. We say, God is love; we mean the love of a holy God; they, the love of a human father, or a weak mother.

Thus all the chief things we hold, the holiness of God, the sinfulness of sin, a radical change of heart, the distinction of believer and unbeliever, Christ's work, faith, pardon, punishment, probation, retribution, the relation of life to immortality—all these, as we hold them, are scornfully rejected by Universalism.

The advocates of the system incessantly affirm its entire incompatibility with our views. Ballou speaks of the "diabolical character" of our views of God's justice and Christ's atonement.\* Whittemore says that we ascribe "the utmost malignity" to God; and, quoting the apostle's statement, "believing ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory," inquires whether they could have so rejoiced, believing the doctrine of endless punishment, "unless they were demons in human form?"† Asher Moore calls our vital views "a belief that outrages reason and shocks humanity."‡ Williamson says that our doctrine of God and his justice is a sentiment which "can originate in and be sustained by nothing short of the most malignant and unpitying cruelty," that "it stoops to commune with the spirit of grim devils and infuriate fiends of darkness. It delights in the yells of the damned," and "those who teach it do worship the beast and his image,

---

\* Voice, p. 33. † Plain Guide, pp. 23, 54. ‡ Un. Bel., p. 131.

and have received the mark of his name.”\* This is the rant which is somewhat habitually poured forth from scores of Universalist pulpits.

A few years since the following statement by Mr. Royce, an evangelical writer, was quoted into the *Trumpet*: “Universalism has a different God,” from Orthodoxy, “a different Christ, a different Spirit, a different sinner, a different sin, a different atonement, a different pardon, a different salvation, a different resurrection, a different judgment, a different punishment, a different heaven and a different hell; in fine, a difference with respect to all the essential doctrines of Christianity.”

Upon this statement Mr. Whittemore remarks, “Mr. Royce is right. To this we give our assent. We confirm his words, that Partialism is in every sense a very different doctrine from Universalism. He cannot represent the difference to be too great.”†

Such is their own estimate. And one of the very ablest of their writers, Rev. I. D. Williamson, has thus pronounced his deliberate judgment: “I have no disposition to conceal the fact that there is a wide and irreconcilable difference between us and our opposers; nor can it be denied that if we are right, they are wrong, not merely in some small points, but radically and, I had almost said, totally wrong. This is a truth with which we are well acquainted, and that man pursues a mistaken policy, nay, a wicked course of hypocrisy, who attempts to conceal this fact. There is no manner of use in endeavoring to make it appear that

---

\* End. Pun., pp. 20, 201. † *Trumpet*, Aug. 18, 1838. Quoted by Rev. N. D. George, p. 376.

there is but a shade of difference between us and other denominations ; for there is a difference high as heaven, wide as the earth ; a difference as hopelessly and utterly irreconcilable as light and darkness ; and there is no disguising the obvious truth that if our system is true the other is false, desperately and hopelessly false, I had almost said, in its whole length and breadth." "A man can no more be a Universalist and a Partialist, than he could serve both God and Baal. I go further, and say that no man can innocently believe the one, and yet support the other."\*

This statement I most heartily endorse—I thank the writer for it—and I commend it to your consideration. Agreeing with him also, that concealment is not only a mistaken policy but a wicked course of hypocrisy—and holding, with all the mind and heart, to the great doctrines of grace, we therefore openly and deliberately maintain, using Mr. Williamson's own words, that

4. That system "is desperately and hopelessly false, in its whole length and breadth."

If ours is light, as we think, that is unmitigated darkness. The great, absorbing and monopolizing doctrine of the whole system—its central and only light, or darkness visible, is the total divorcement of our moral behavior here from our condition hereafter, and the audacious doctrine that no matter how vile and loathsome, to the last breath he draws, every man shall wake to perfect bliss. It is not held as a side speculation, an incidental prospect or probability. It is the whole scope of the system. This is dinned in men's

---

\* Exposition, pp. 215, 216.

ears as the substance of all doctrine. For this, and in this, and by this, the whole system has its being. It is the one brazen note of their "Trumpet," the everlasting gospel of their pulpit. It is the kernel and the covering of the whole system—its life and glory—its body and soul—its head, hoof and horns.

Now with such a system as that, evangelical Christianity has nothing in common, but the two covers of the Bible. The systems are, we agree with Mr. Williamson, as utterly and hopelessly irreconcilable as "light and darkness," the worship of "Baal" or the devil, and the worship of "God." And while, therefore, I have no expectation or desire of changing the usage of speech, which classes it under the general head of Christianity, I make no secret of the fact that without abandoning my own apprehensions of Christianity, I cannot as matter of fact recognize the system which I have here set forth, the system taught by H. Ballou, and Whittemore, and Williamson, and Cobb, and Asher Moore, as any form, branch or part of the Christian religion. And this is the unanimous sentiment of evangelical preachers of the gospel, and intelligent private Christians in our churches.

You are thus prepared to understand the reason why we also maintain that

5. The ministration of the system is no preaching of the gospel, but of Satan's doctrine. In truth, the position is put into our mouth by the very advocates of the system. They say the two systems are hopelessly irreconcilable—as much so as light and darkness, the service of God and of Baal. We take them at their own word ; if our doctrine is of God, theirs is of dark-



ness, of Baal, of Satan. There is no help for it. And we add our own word to their admission. We believe they proclaim one of the most ruinous and destructive and groveling of falsehoods ever broached on earth—and we believe the devil is the father of lies. And from before the time when Lemuel Haynes preached from the text, “and the serpent said unto the woman, ye shall not surely die,” and from the proposition, “Satan the first Universalist preacher,” down to the present, that has been the view of all intelligent evangelical Christians. We maintain that with our present views of Christianity, whatever may be a man’s character as a friend, a citizen and a neighbor, and all that, yet, *in his official capacity*, any man who proclaims that system is one of Satan’s preachers, and not a minister of Christ’s gospel, however eloquent he may be. This view, I say, belongs to our system, and not to me personally. The things are irreconcilable. And if this open and deliberate statement gives a surprise to any man in this city, much more to any evangelical Christian, it is time that shock had been given long ago. Men must understand they are two different roads—and make their choice between them. If our road leads to Heaven, theirs leads to Hell. We pretend to no partnership. And much as I would shrink from being the keeper of a gambling saloon, tempting young men to squander for naught their earthly substance; much as I would recoil from being the owner of a dram shop, where men are beguiled against their better knowledge, to their temporal and eternal ruin; with far intenser horror should I beg to be delivered from *the wholesale sin*, and the awful responsibility of delu-



ding, on settled principle, the drunkard, and the blasphemer, and the rake, Sabbath after Sabbath, with the cry of "peace, peace," where God has uttered no peace, and with the hope that they shall pass at once from the pestilential atmosphere of their earthly lives into the bliss of God on high. And when this work is done under pretence of exalting God and man, when, under pretext of extolling his love and mercy, every high moral attribute of God's nature is ground into the dust, it is but Satan transformed, as usual, into the guise of an angel of light, and his ministers transformed as the ministers of righteousness. I know that it is said—and that is the grand plea—it makes the sinner's present life so happy. So does ardent spirit make men happy; but there's death in the cup. So does opium make men happy; but it makes them fools. So does delirium often make men happy; but it is the happiness of the madman. And oh! if this doctrine, so captivating to a sinful heart, be but a delusion, what a terrible delusion it is; and how dreadfully it shall be dispelled at the judgment seat of Christ! If it be but the intoxicating cup to the human soul, what a very wine of devils it is; and he that has been intoxicated with that cup throughout this short day of life, to what a fearful heartache shall he waken on the long, dark morrow of eternity!

## LECTURE SECOND.

### THE MORE OBVIOUS MARKS OF FALSEHOOD.

Matthew XVI: 23. But he turned and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me: for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.

THE tendency of some things is recondite; that of others, direct and obvious. Some propositions and systems, like Cain, bear the devil's mark on their forehead, as well as in their heart. So was it with this advice which Peter gave to Jesus—and Peter cringed before rebuke. So is it with the system of Modern Universalism,—the system which cuts off all moral connection between this life and the life to come, and teaches that all men, however vile on earth, at death awake only to eternal blessedness, and that, too, with no aid from Jesus Christ. It is as destitute of external verisimilitude, as it is of inward truth. It is hardly even a whited sepulchre. Full of dead men's bones within, it is garnished with dead men's bones without.

In due order, I shall examine the entire argument on which it rests, and indicate its rottenness. For the present, I wish to call your attention to some of

### THE MORE OBVIOUS MARKS OF THE UNGODLY ORIGIN OF MODERN UNIVERSALISM.

1. The natural import of Scripture in all its parts, is against it. No recondite interpretations are required to show the falsity of the system—it lies on the whole

face of the Scripture so clear that plain men feel it—they cannot help feeling it. The manifest drift of the whole Bible is, that there is a God of spotless purity, intensely abhorring sin, the eternal foe of all who persist in sin; man a sinner, to whom mercy and pardon are now offered through Jesus Christ; this life the scene of mercy and of possible change; the next, of changeless retribution, the endless reaping of a life-long sowing. So transparent is the teaching, that it shows itself to every mind at first sight. The preacher who teaches it, has but to read straight on in the Scriptures without note or comment, and his hearers imbibe the doctrine. The Bible speaks for him in far more awful terms than he can invent. They that teach Universalism cannot venture to let the Scripture alone—it requires a constant system of ledgerdemain to hide its obvious meaning—a running warfare with its plain sense. They must select, and explain away, and avoid, and soften down, and deny. God's fierce wrath is not fierce wrath—his hatred of sin and sinners is no hatred—forever is not forever—punishment is not punishment—forgiveness is not forgiveness—vengeance is love and kindness—salvation is relief from anxiety and fear—Satan is nothing—hell a figure of speech with no particular meaning; and so on from beginning to end. To frame the system of universal salvation out of the Bible, the volume has to be put perpetually to the rack, and every joint of it dislocated. And after all, there remain a multitude of passages which the preacher loves not to read to his congregation, and many which he dares not read without comment or change of the text.

On this point, the vast mass of good men have been agreed in all ages. The dissent among the best Christians has been literally of no account — scarcely enough for the natural vagaries of the human mind. This unanimous understanding of the holiest men, of the men who receive God's word most humbly, is deeply significant.

Infidels—the extreme opposite class, the men who wholly reject God's word—are also agreed, that the plain teaching of the Bible, is eternal punishment. Says Theodore Parker, “I believe that Jesus Christ taught eternal torment. I do not accept it on his authority.”\* So the writings of Davis and Hare make this doctrine the grand point of their attack. A Universalist preacher was attempting to persuade an infidel member of his congregation to receive the Bible, by explaining away its threatenings. The infidel listened patiently for a while, but at length broke in, “It is of no use to talk in that way; the Bible is full of hell, and every body knows that it is.”† But why accumulate instances, when the fact is notorious that skeptics agree as to what the Bible teaches on this point. Says the Universalist, Asher Moore, “All skeptics, so far as we have been able to ascertain their views, suppose the Bible to teach the doctrine of endless misery; and on this ground they reject it.”‡ What can be more deeply significant than the fact, that both the great bulk of those who most humbly submit to the Bible, and those who openly refuse its authority, agree on this point?

The more intelligent questioners of the *eternity* of

---

\* “Universalism Examined,” p. 250. † Two Sermons, p. 14.

‡ Univ. Belief, p. 51.

future punishment, who receive the Bible, admit that their view is not taught there. In May, 1853, the American Unitarian Association issued a Report, in which they avow that a large majority of them hold the doctrine of the final Restoration of all souls; but they distinctly say, "it is our firm conviction, that the final restoration of all, is not revealed in the Scriptures," but it is only a glorious hope which seems to them a "warranted *inference* from the cardinal principles of Christianity, as well as from the great verities of moral science."\* Here is an admission from a class of men who, for intelligence, learning and character, are as far in advance of the Universalist ministry, as one class of men can well be before another. John Foster too, has been often appealed to of late, as doubting eternal punishment, and hoping for final recovery, ages hence; but Foster distinctly admits that his questioning is founded only on the mercy of God, and that Scripture is "formidably strong" against him.

In truth, the system of Universalism would get along a great deal better without the Bible. That constitutes its great difficulty, its insurmountable difficulty. It were easy to frame a moderately plausible argument, but for the word of God, and a few stubborn facts in Providence. The word of God is, in truth, the only source from which has come the doctrine of eternal punishment to all the impenitent. And when the thin web of sophistry is spun ever so fine, the solemn warnings of Jesus about the soul and its danger, such passages as the story of Dives, the narration of the final

---

\* Annual Report, May 24, 1853, p. 28.

judgment, or the terrible words of the apostles, come driving over it like some ponderous wheel over the thin gossamer web that lies on the grass. Its fabricators feel it—they shrink from it—they dread those portions of Scripture—they crawl and writhe under them. Their chief function is to explain them away.

The obvious meaning of the Bible—obvious to its most submissive subjects and its most determined rejectors alike, obvious to the common mind and the child, obvious to the vast majority of those who have read its pages—stamps the system not of God. So obvious is the meaning, that advocates of Universalism frequently confine their reading to certain favorite passages; and instances are on record, of those thus trained, who, on reading the scriptures as they stand, have been confounded, and have abandoned their belief.

2. Another obvious mark of the ungodly origin of the system, is the emergencies to which it is reduced.

One of its emergencies is that it is driven chiefly beyond the Bible. It is essentially Deistic. You may observe it where you will, the great stress of the Universalist argument *is its own reasonings* about God's benevolence—God's being our Father—and how no *father* can be so severe. On that idea it is perpetually harping.\* Not what God has said, but what *from the nature of the case* he must do; a purely deistic argument. And in their private arguings, the more incautious of the sect occasionally avow that they care not if the Bible is against them. Matthew Hale Smith

---

\*E. g., in Ballou's Lecture Sermons this appeal meets us, in a longer or shorter form, between twenty and thirty times.



testifies that "he has often heard them say both in the pulpit and out of it, that they would reject the Bible if they thought it did not teach Universalism."\* Similar declarations have fallen under my knowledge. And it is noteworthy how the arguments of the sect are invariably preceded by the laying down of certain principles, to which the word of God must be wrenched. "First principles," says Moore, "should govern our investigations on every subject; and whatever stands opposed to acknowledged and known truths, we may safely decide has no reasonable claims to our confidence and belief." In the next sentence he applies the principle by saying that "we should carefully exclude from our credenda every principle that stands opposed in its nature or tendency to [the attribute of] love." Of course the case is settled for him. The same writer asks significantly concerning the skeptic, "When such [i. e. eternal punishment] is declared to be the doctrine of that book which proclaims good tidings of great joy that shall be to all people, *who can blame a man for pausing* to inquire before he believes?"† Hosea Ballou deliberately informs us that he "should feel justified in restraining any passages, could such be found, that should seem to favor an opinion so dishonorable to God, and so revolting to our best feelings."‡ Rev. T. B. Thayer, after arguing universal salvation *as an inference* from God's being our Father, closes thus: "One of two things is certain—if God is the Father of all men, endless misery is false; *or if endless misery is true*, God is not the Father of all men, and *the Bible*

---

\* "Univ. Examined, &c.," p. 178. † Un. Bel. pp. 63, 52. ‡ Lect. Sermon. p. 193.



*is false.* Reader, you cannot hesitate in your choice.”\* My hearer, ponder this last bold statement, published during the present year, and see what less it means than this: I will sooner reject the Bible than receive the doctrine of endless misery.

So Williamson informs us, near the opening of his argument, that “man is authorized to reject any and every doctrine that contradicts these first principles.” And the nature of *his* first principles may be learned from his remark a few pages later: “It is easy to see that on the supposition of the truth of the doctrine of endless misery, the meanest worm holds the tenure of his existence on better terms than man; and I frankly say, had it been left to my choice, I would not for worlds have accepted the gift of life, even with a possibility of its coming to such a horrid catastrophe.”† There is a confession for you—there is one of the first principles according to which the doctrines of the Bible are to be received or rejected: an emergency, indeed!

The emergencies of the system show themselves further yet. It bears the devil’s mark in the necessity it finds to disparage and wear down all the principal teachings of the Bible. See it in the necessity to degrade God from the lofty throne on which he describes himself as “hating all the workers of iniquity,” to a level with themselves. See it in the deliberate attempt to depreciate the enormity of sin. It is the settled proposition of the system that such men as Edwards, Payson, and the like, overestimate the evil of sin. A

---

\* Tracts for the People (Boston, 1856), p. 51. This is the series endorsed by the Un. Companion and Register as one of the best, if not the best, extant. † End. Pun. Ex., pp. 24, 31.

system reduced to such a strait, is low, indeed. We need no teacher to pacify our thoughts of guilt—we need the teacher from God to stir them up. Do we not know that our own hearts, taught by Satan, are prone enough to excuse it? Is it not our constant temptation to say to ourselves, “our guilt is slight, this sin is little?” And when a teacher comes aiding that vile suggestion of our heart, do we not know his mission? When a system comes so seconding human depravity, is not the Devil’s mark on its forehead?

The emergencies of the system show themselves in its downward history. It started on a Calvinistic base—it started professing to receive all the evangelical doctrines save this one; long ago it saw the necessity of rejecting the whole to speed its race and save its life, and long ago it cast the last fragment overboard. It started with the unanimous admission of some future punishment; but the rickety system shook under the load, and to save itself in the downhill pressure, it cast it all off by the roadside. It has fulfilled the prediction—“evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse;” and its emergencies have been so great and increasing, that one by one it has thrown away almost everything distinctive in the Bible,—Christ’s Divinity, the atonement, eternal salvation by Christ, depravity, regeneration, probation, forgiveness proper, and punishment proper, whether here or hereafter.

3. The inconsistencies and gross absurdities of the system, clearly show its ungodly origin. It is a bundle of contradictions. It now assures us that men will be saved because God is a merciful God; and on the next page virtually denies all mercy in our salvation, for it

holds that all sin is punished to the full extent of its desert; and consequently we are saved not of mercy, but of justice. Will it be believed that such a man as Whittemore, in the very book in which he distinctly affirms that Christ came to save men only from evils of this life, yet quotes numerous passages that speak of Christ as a *Savior*, in order to prove the doctrine of *final blessedness*? Yet it is even so.\*

Will it be believed, too, that the system can be so inconsistent as to assert that certain portions of Scripture have had their entire fulfilment here on earth, and yet to cull out extracts from those very passages and use them in support of final blessedness in heaven? Yet it is even so. In order to escape the terrible force of John's Revelation, it was necessary for them to maintain that the book had its fulfilment at the destruction of Jerusalem. Yet some of the favorite passages urged by them for final salvation are from that very book. Even Hosea Ballou, 2d, some years ago, cautioned them thus: "Universalists have not wholly ceased to quote as proof of the final reconciliation of all men, the following text: 'And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb forever;'"† a text which, if we mistake not their views concerning the general plan of this book, they can by no means suppose, on

---

\* The first statement is on page 254 of the Plain Guide: the arguments and quotations, on pages 30, 32, 34, 35, 38 of the same vol.

† Rev. 5. 13.

careful reflection, to refer to a period yet future. It should not be forgotten that all the passages we have set down are taken from those very chapters which are now universally regarded as having their fulfilment on the earth; and that unless we renounce this opinion, we are of course precluded from adducing them as proof of "the state of things in another world." So far are they from having ceased to do this thing that this very inconsistency is common, and their ablest writers thus contradict themselves *in the same book*. Thus in the stereotyped edition of Whittemore's Plain Guide this very passage is adduced as an argument.\* Whittemore also uses as another argument, Rev. 21:4, "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes," etc.† And yet this very writer in this same book,‡ affirms that the transactions recorded four verses before and four verses after this, are fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem. In the first, he goes back two thousand years, and locates "the book of life," "the second death" and "the lake of fire," at the fall of Jerusalem; four verses more and he has strode forth into eternity, "there shall be no more death;" four verses onward he is back to the destruction of Jerusalem, and there is where "all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone," which is "the second death!" And where, I ask, shall any man that deals so with scripture, have his part?

Intending on a future occasion to trace and show more in detail the absurdities of these arguings, I waive a further discussion of them at the present, to say a

---

\* Plain Guide, p. 52. † Id., p. 53. ‡ Id., pp. 223, 227, 143.

few words on the absurdities and gross imbecilities of the scripture explanations given by the system. Indeed there is no system about it, but a series of ever-shifting and absurd expedients, a succession of juggleries practised on persons ignorant of God's word. The only system that runs through them, is the constant, painful effort to take off the edge and power of not alone the passages which teach eternal punishment, but of all that teach God's hatred of sin, his anger and indignation, human danger and destiny,—and to reduce them to inanity. It is painfully instructive to read through the two hundred pages, in which Whittemore thus passes through his crucible a hundred and twenty-six of the sternest passages of the Bible, and shows you nothing but ashes as the result. For example, Christ himself interprets his own parable of the tares, and tells what it means. "The enemy that sowed them," he says, "is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As, therefore, the tares are gathered and burned in the fire so shall it be at the end of the world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; and there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." So Christ interpreted his own parable. But the Savior's interpretation required mending by Mr. Thomas Whittemore.\* Christ said the "enemy is the devil;"—"it is a 'perverse and wicked spirit'

---

\* Plain Guide, p. 102. More fully in "Notes on the Parables," p. 52.

opposed to the spirit of Christ," says Mr. Whittemore. "The harvest is the end of the world," said Christ;—"the end of the Mosaic age," says Whittemore. "The reapers are the angels," "the angels of the Son of Man," says Christ;—"the angels mean the Roman armies," expounds Whittemore, "which God sent to destroy his rebellious people, the Jews." "They shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity," said Christ;—"the Jews," says Whittemore. "Shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth;"—"the city of Jerusalem," says Whittemore. "The righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father;"—"it is the comparative earthly felicity of Christians," says Whittemore, "after the Jews were destroyed." Such felicity, doubtless, as they experienced when John was banished to Patmos under Domitian, and they were put to the rack under Trajan, and became the sport of wild beasts in the Colosseum under Hadrian and Mark Aurelius.

In this style the system goes on. We read in Whittemore that "hell," in its more terrible meaning, is a filthy place in a valley just out of Jerusalem, and "hell-fire," the fire that burnt the offal there; "eternal damnation" is the "judgment of the age;" "the Lord Jesus Christ revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," indicates "the dissolution of the Jewish state;" "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," is "the banishment of the Jews from their own land;" "eternal judgment" is "an ancient judg-



ment," one past long ago.\* Its stated effort is to reduce all the tremendous threatenings of a holy God, when God calls the wicked "accursed," threatens "wrath without mixture," and the like, to expressions of *parental interest* and promises of salutary correction for their good: as though an anxious parent should describe his family discipline in this wise: "Very difficult and trying duties have devolved on me of late; I have been under the necessity of cursing my eldest son, and pouring out upon him my wrath without mixture; I have made my daughter anathema, and have come out against her in great fury and with fiery indignation. They are cursed children."† Such is the language which this system describes as the language of paternal correction. How horrible! And to crown the climax of absurdity, Mr. Whittemore finds it necessary for his purposes to show that Judas Iscariot was a specimen of genuine repentance, whose "sorrow caused his death."‡ Such are the "genuine

---

\* Plain Guide, pp. 135, 190, 192, 197.

† Lectures by Joel Parker, D. D., p. 36.

‡ Lest the reader should be incredulous, I quote the passage:

"It should be remembered that Judas fully repented of his sin. That his repentance was genuine, is evident from the following considerations: 1. He confessed his guilt. 2. He asserted the innocence of Christ. 3. He returned the money. 4. His sorrow caused his death, which it could not have done on any other supposition than that it was sincere." (!) Plain Guide, p. 132.

The reader will see the exigency of Mr. Whittemore, when he remembers Christ's terrible words: "It had been good for that man if he had not been born." To destroy the plain force of that passage, it became necessary also to deny that Judas committed suicide (against the clear statement of not only our translation, but the Greek original), and moreover, that it was Judas who went "to his own place" (Acts, 1:25);



penitents" that people a Universalist heaven; there are many more of the kind there, no doubt, besides Saint Judas:—Saint Jeroboam, Saint Jezebel, Saints Ananias and Sapphira, and a kindred host.

Such are some of the absurdities of which the system is full, and which mark its origin. An infidel of Alleghany county, N. Y., one day met a Universalist and addressed him thus: "You Universalists are the most inconsistent theorists in the world. You say there is no future punishment, and yet you profess to receive the Bible, and what is more absurd, profess to prove your doctrine from the Bible. You stretch out one passage interminably, and cut another short off; you pull connected sentences apart, and put disconnected sentences together; you set prophets at war with prophets, apostles with apostles, and each one at war with himself. As sure as your Bible is true, so surely there is a hell. For my own part, I do not believe there is a hell any more than yourself; but more consistent, I throw the doctrine of future punishment out of my creed by first throwing out the Bible. And there is no other way to appear consistent. Get clear of that old book, and then you can easily get rid of the rest."

---

furthermore, to take the astounding position that Judas's sorrow caused his death, and "*could not have done*" so, unless it were genuine repentance. Behold a good specimen of the system—denying the plainest statements of the Bible, and then bringing platoon after platoon of the same miserable evasions to back the first.

Ballou remarks, Lect. Sermon, p. 290, that Judas's exclamation when he threw down the money, ("I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood,") "*shows the high estimation in which this unhappy man held innocence.*" Not a bad specimen of Hosea Ballou.

4. A fourth mark of the ungodly origin of the system is its moral tendencies. But as I shall probably devote an entire discourse to this subject, I waive it now.

5. A fifth mark of its origin is the immoral sympathies and desires which it enlists. It is sure to enlist the sympathies of the vilest of men; and the viler a man becomes, the more earnest are his sympathies with the system, and the intenser his desires for its truth. A man willing to obey God, or a bad man repenting truly, has no occasion to fear the doctrine. But vile men *determined to remain vile*, are sure to hug it to their hearts. \* It gathers up that kind of sympathy as surely as a magnet draws iron, or a carcass draws vultures. And when has conversion to Universalism ever led to a reformation of character? A multitude of cases is on record where genuine evangelical conversion *from* Universalism has led the wicked to forsake his wickedness; but where a case of the converse? Where is the instance? *one instance*—whether converted from orthodoxy or from infidelity? Nay, when the evangelical professor becomes a Universalist, he is very sure to stop praying, and often he begins to violate the Sabbath, to become profane and reckless; or, when an evangelical professor begins to do these things, he is very prone to turn Universalist. For example, when the Second Universalist Society in Lynn was formed, it was found by careful examination that nearly all its members were Methodist backsliders—men who had lost their religion, as they phrase it.\* A system

---

\* Cooke's "Two Centuries."

that enlists such sympathies has a bad brand on it.

6. Common sense and general conscience stamp it as ungodly in its origin. Let it meanwhile be borne in mind that the system holds out the strongest possible temptations to belief, if it could but be made plausible. Every man who has not submitted to the claims of Christ—that is, all men at some period of life, and many men all through their lives—is tempted powerfully to embrace the system. Our affection for our departed friends also proffers strong inducements to lay hold of it. I heard one say—and I saw the work of the Tempter, for it is the frequent appeal of his emissaries—“One who has lost friends as I have, is strongly persuaded to doubt the doctrine of future punishment.” I heard another say—and his career had been a wild one—“I have tried hard to believe in Universal salvation, but neither the Bible nor common sense would suffer it.” Yes, notwithstanding the powerful and universal temptations, the common sense and the common conscience rise above it. The heathen never sunk so low in their moral notions as to think the gods would put no difference hereafter between the good man and the bad. You must tamper long with any man’s reason and conscience, who has seen how some single sin often dogs the sinner with its punishment from early youth to hoary age, and how character flows on like a river in an unbroken stream, before you can persuade him that the man who, after a life of iniquity, lies down with his soul putrid with corruption, and shuts his eyes, breathing out malice and blasphemy against man and God and Christ, in the next moment comes forth like an angel of God,

pure, holy and seraphic, free from all relic of the blasphemies that filled his throat an instant before ;—that the man struck down in the scene of low vice is offering sweet incense unto God while the body that he left is still reeking with rum, and that his soul is swelling with rapturous songs to Christ ere the echoes of his cursings have died out from the drunkard's saloon below. You may talk to him in vague terms, as you will, of all men's entering heaven alike ; but bring him actually to look in on such scenes as where Hervey or Scott or Payson, after long lives of growing purity and love to God, are breathing out their souls in strains of heavenly affection to the Lord Jesus, and longing to be in his presence—then on such scenes as where Thomas Paine, after a life of evil influence and of foul iniquity, now lies sinking to his grave, steeped much of the time in strong drink, shrieking when left alone by day or night, shocking with his abusive language the kind woman who acted as his nurse, now alarming the whole house with his incessant cries—“O Lord help me! God help me! Jesus Christ help me!”—yet convulsed with anger at the very mention of religion, and raising his cane to strike the elder who mentioned to him the name of Jesus Christ: let him gaze in on these different scenes—tell him that when their breath stops, all these men shall join hands in loving companionship around the throne of the Savior whom one cursed and the other adored with their latest breath, and it shocks all his common sense.

The very child sees through it. A Universalist preacher was telling his little son the story of “the Children in the Wood.” The boy asked, “what be-

came of the innocent little children?" "They went to heaven," replied the father. "And what became of the wicked old uncle?" "He went to heaven too." "Won't he kill them again, father," said the boy. The question was too much even for the father; he never rested till he renounced the system, and became a pious man and a preacher of evangelical religion.

Nay, the truth is, this system was too much even for the conscience and common sense of the first Universalists. It was only by a process of education that men sunk to adopt this system. They began by holding to Christ as an atoning Savior, to the infinite ill-desert of sin, from which men were saved only by Christ's merits: they believed, to a man, (so says Hosea Ballou,) in the limited future punishment of the impenitent. But other men, educated under the system and seeing that inextricable difficulties followed the admission of any future punishment, discarded the notion wholly; and, as evil men and seducers wax worse and worse, they then found it necessary to cast overboard all the other great doctrines of the gospel—because it was impossible then to retain them. But so strenuously did the earlier Universalist conscience resist these steps of degradation, that it raised "a conflict between the preachers of Universalism almost as sharp as that which had been carried on between Universalists and their opposers," threatening "lamentable consequences."<sup>\*</sup> In a downward course, as usual, the Devil triumphed; but not until it had been proved that even the *Universalist* conscience at first

---

<sup>\*</sup> Ballou's Voice, p. 36.

revolted at the system which contradicts the moral judgment of the human race.

7. Another of the obvious marks of the falsehood of the system, is found in the manifest uneasiness of its advocates.

It is difficult to get behind the curtain, and those who have once been there, and come forth to give their testimony, like Matthew Hale Smith, are pursued with an obloquy that impairs their testimony;—and it is not impossible indeed that their long subjection to demoralizing influences may sometimes leave a permanent effect on their habits of speech. Mr. Smith has given a sad picture of the unsettled views of many who are to appearance unwavering advocates of the system, and has introduced us to the unsolved doubts of even their preachers, and their private admissions of the sophistry of much of their arguments. I do not however propose to avail myself of that evidence on the present occasion. There is other evidence more obvious.

It is found partly in the writhing of Universalists under the preaching of judgment and retribution. Regarding it as an exploded superstition, it ought to affect them, when they hear it, no more than a heathen fable; at most they should merely pity the weakness of us who believe it. But is that the fact? Not so—not at all. Let an advocate of that system be present on some occasion when the doctrine of God's future vengeance toward the wicked is fully set forth, and it stirs him up, and agitates, and perhaps exasperates him. He complains of it—he shuns it. He cringes under the very phraseology of God himself—it distresses him



to hear it. It is the testimony of his drugged conscience, pierced by the truth, and showing by its writhings that it has been reached by no other weapon than that two-edged sword, which is the word of God.

The same uneasiness shows itself in the constant warfare which the system keeps up. It is forever battling orthodoxy, and trying to get into a controversy. A Universalist congregation, it has been said, cannot be kept quiet long, without having its favorite opiate. A Universalist preacher cannot rest easy unless he can be wrangling with the Orthodox. A vast proportion of the sermons are expended on this subject, and a large part of these in explaining away the troublesome passages of scripture.\* I have been twice challenged to a public wrangle; the challenges have been publicly rung on my name; my stated preaching in my own Church, has furnished themes for I know not how many Universalist Philippics. The system seems to be like a man when he can reel along, but cannot stand still; or, more exactly, when he can stand only by pushing against a post. Opposition is its life and soul. Why, now, this incessant necessity for a wrangle? There is nothing at stake, if Universalism be true. According to the system, all will go well with us whether we believe it or not! And mean-

---

\* Smith says, (p. 113,) that nine-tenths of all the Universalist Sermons he ever heard, aimed to disprove endless misery; and that "at least two-thirds of all their preaching is designed to explain away the unfavorable appearances" of scripture. Un. Ex., p. 178.

Without insisting on mathematical accuracy of proportion, there is good evidence of the truth of this statement. In those many places where the preacher comes but few times in the year, it may be questioned whether any other subject of preaching is *ever* introduced.

while *our* faith makes *us* happy. Why then not let us alone? We who believe that God will punish hereafter, solemn and momentous as is the doctrine, do not feel necessitated to force it out of all proportion in our preaching. We imply it always, indeed, but preach it only occasionally; and then feel no necessity to wrangle continually with opposers. We discuss it and let it alone—as I shall now. We know it to be God's truth—we rest satisfied. But the advocates of Universal Salvation are never easy. Though if their doctrine is true, *there is absolutely nothing at stake on its reception*, yet its advocates are thus perpetually boiling over with the subject. What means this incessant din? Ah, I will tell you!—it is the sound of “breakers ahead”—it is the agitation of the surf as it beats upon the rocks—it is the tossing of the troubled ocean when it cannot rest, whose waters “cast up mire and dirt.”

Not alone in its wrangling propensities, but in its incessant craving for its customary opiate, in its keen sensitiveness under examination and exposure, or even under passing allusions to false teachers, in its eagerness to warp to its seeming support the names of a few evangelical believers, and by many other signs it shows that it is not at rest. Difficult as it is, of course, to elicit the confession, there are abundant indications that the case of him described by Dr. Spencer, is not uncommon.\* He was a bold and zealous Universalist, the chief pillar of the denomination in the town where he dwelt. His daughter who had married and removed

---

\* Pastor's Sketches, second series.

to Brooklyn, was brought under deep conviction of sin. She lingered long without relief, hindered by the clinging remains of her Universalism. At length all other props gave way, except the force of her father's influence. While she was in deep trouble, the father spent a week at her house; and though he saw her trouble and guessed its cause, he evaded every opportunity to explain. At length, as he was on the point of departure, in deep anguish she threw herself upon his neck, and entreated him by the love he bore her not to deceive her, but to tell her truly whether he did believe that all men would be saved. Overcome by the appeal, with great agitation he replied, "I think it very likely *that some will be lost forever*"—and hurried away. She corresponded with him; and the love he bore her made him advise her to adopt the Presbyterian belief rather than the Universalist. With her last prop swept away, she gave up, and became an humble and rejoicing believer. But that father—what of him? The very man who had made that admission and given that advice, returned to his post, and again became, and continued to be, the chief supporter of the deadly delusion.

Such cases, I say, there is reason to believe, are not uncommon,—the bold exterior, and the misgiving soul. It is not in human nature thus to come in point-blank collision with the plain word of God, without feeling at times that all human assertions are but a frail guaranty that when God threatens "*everlasting* punishment," he will break his word.

Their uneasiness and consciousness of the falsity of the system often shows itself terribly at the hour of

death. I am not going to deny that some adherents of the system, die sustained by their delusion ; nor on the other hand, that evangelical professors are sometimes troubled about their hope in the last hour ; nor shall I attempt any comparison between the proportion of such cases. Professors of religion often have doubts about their acceptance with Christ, and because their lives have been such.

But there is one mighty and remarkable difference in the two kinds of cases. Whenever a dying Christian is agitated in the last hour, it is with no doubts of the *truth of HIS SYSTEM* ; it is only with fears *for his own personal relation* to that system. He has lived afar off—his own grasp is feeble—his *personal* evidence is dim ; but the system lies before him, an eternal rock. Give him but clear, full assurance that his own heart has laid hold on that salvation, and he goes down with a calmness and confidence that not all hell can shake, with a light that the dark valley cannot dim. That rock is there—his only question is, “do I stand upon it?”

But when the Universalist doubts, as he often does in that hour, it is of the whole system on which he rests. The very earth on which he stands is crumbling away beneath his feet ; he, and his hope, and his system, are sinking down to hell together. It is an awful position ;—he clung to the rock that overhung the gulf, but alas ! he sees it now cracking away, and rock and man are about to be buried together in the boiling abyss. Such is sometimes the terrible experience of the advocates of the system. On the 29th day of September, 1827, (for example,) in Windham,

Greene county, N. York, died David W. Bell, a zealous defender of this pernicious system, and a writer for the Gospel Advocate. For several weeks while the fatal disease was upon him, he felt the miserable delusion to be giving way beneath him. "Father," said he, "I find eternal punishment, which I have so long disputed, now to be an awful reality. As soon as I am dead, write to brother E., and to Z. T. and S. T., that the doctrine we have tried to propagate is an awful delusion, that it forsook me on a death bed." Sometimes he would cry aloud to God for mercy—again entreat his Maker to annihilate him; sometimes he would call on others to pray—again would beg them not to pray for him, for he had already sealed his own damnation. "Oh," said he, "it can alone be for the glory of God and the good of others for me to be damned! I must be damned! I am damned—damned to all eternity. I cannot live in peace, I cannot die in peace, without the assurance that my renunciation of the delusive and dangerous heresy shall be as public as my defence of it was. Oh, could I speak to those deluded Universalists." And so he died. "The above recantation," says David Bell his father, "was made by my son when in the full exercise of reason. Of this, there are many witnesses. Neither was it extorted from him or occasioned by sudden fright. It was from a deliberate and settled conviction for weeks."\* Many, no doubt, die firm or stupid; but there are many such cases as this—and in them all, the doubt is not of the man's relation to the system, but

---

\* Arvine's Cyc., p. 426.

the *system sinks* ; all, all goes down together with awful crash and horrible despair.

But in the annals of the world is there a case on record, where a dying man lamented his adhesion to the doctrines of grace ? And though a Christian pass away under a cloud, his lament is never that he had, but that he *had not*, clung with all his heart to those doctrines. The despairing Universalist charges his ruin to his confidence in *his system* — the beclouded believer to non-conformity to his.

But I must close. In my next discourse, I may examine more minutely the Universalist argument. Meanwhile, I think we may say of a system that so contradicts the obvious import of the Bible as understood by the common reader and the great mass of men, by the best Christians and the united body of infidels, as well as the more intelligent restorationists ; that is driven to such emergencies ; that is guilty of such gross inconsistencies and absurdities ; that gathers round it such a mass of immoral sympathies and support ; that so contradicts common sense and general conscience ; that keeps its advocates in such an uneasy state, writhing, and wrangling to keep their courage up, and yet often breaks down with unmitigated and portentous despair in the most trying hour of life — we may say of it, it carries the mark of its Parentage on its brow ; and we may say to it “ Get thee behind me, SATAN.”



## LECTURE THIRD.

### THE UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT, DESTRUCTIVE.

Isaiah xxviii: 17, 18. Judgment also will I lay to the line, and righteousness to the plummet: and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding place. And your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it.

I HAVE exhibited the nature and characteristics of Modern Universalism. I have pointed out the more obvious marks of falsity which it bears on its forehead. I come now more particularly to consider it as “a refuge of lies,” in its arguings; and shall discuss

### THE UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

And here my limits forbid the discussion of the subordinate errors, which fill up the framework of the system and make it false in every part. I must confine my examination chiefly to its main point, viz: its denial of all moral connexion between this life and the future, its assertion that all men, irrespective of character and conduct here, and without any indebtedness to the Lord Jesus Christ, rise from the dead to eternal blessedness.

I. The most incessant and arduous labor of the system—and the most hopeless—is its efforts to grind away the fearful threats of God’s word.

II. Its most impotent and distasteful work, is the struggle to bring a few passages of Scripture to its own support.

III. Its noisiest pretence, is the attempt to sustain itself by certain inferences from God's character.

IV. Its most effective appliance, is its constant appeal to the sympathies, principles, and passions of impenitent men.

I propose to examine these several attempts in their order. And

I. Let me show you a portion of the scriptures which it is the chief business of its advocates to break down and pulverize; and give you specimens of the mode in which they are bereft of meaning by Universalism.

Let it be observed, however, that these passages almost entirely omit that vast body of texts, which describe God's abhorrence of sin, and his hot displeasure towards it and its perpetrators. They also omit that immense class, filling the Bible, which proffers the favor of God *only on conditions*. Indeed, notwithstanding the number and the fearful distinctness of God's threats of future vengeance, perhaps even they are less permanently impressive to the humble Christian than those solemn constant assurances of his holiness and his abhorrence of sin, with which his word is freighted; and especially those conditional promises, which alone are made to the righteous. For, laden as the Bible is with proffers of favor and blessing to the righteous, not one of them all — and he that runs may read — not one, but involves the condition, express or implied, of love and obedience to God.

Indeed, there runs through the whole plan of salvation, and through all God's addresses to sinners, a fearful sense of their danger, an alarming urgency, a Divine solemnity of warning, which, doubtless, make a deeper impression on the habitual reader, than it is possible for the most strenuous extracts to effect. It is like the sight of the actual Alps, gathering all around the traveller's way and crowding on his gaze, in comparison with the detached sketches of the tourist. He feels that to deny all danger beyond this life, is to convert all that is vast and solemn in the Plan of Salvation into mockery and farce. The contemplation of that whole scheme, as it lies in God's word, and of the wonderful mission of Christ, is fitted to produce the highest sense of human danger. But I must hasten from the topic, with this passing allusion.

I shall not even afford the time for comments as I proceed, but am willing—as the Universalist never dares—to leave the pure word of God to its own impression. But take notice how little these passages depend on the use of the word “Hell,” or any one term or phrase. but how all the resources of language, and every device of imagination, seem to be racked and exhausted to express the theme. It is no pleasant task for me to gather up such fearful threats. I only hope that God will enable you and me, by faith and repentance, to escape their power.

My readers will not fail to observe, as I proceed, that these passages, though quoted for their bearing on the doctrine of future punishment, do most abundantly maintain all the associated doctrines which Universalists discard. God's holiness, his intense hatred, of sin

and his anger against sinners, human depravity, the need of regeneration, the radical difference between believers and unbelievers, Christ's work the only ground of acceptance and final salvation, remission of punishment for Christ's sake, human probation,—all these points and others are incidentally but emphatically taught in the passages which will be quoted.

The doctrine of a righteous retribution after death is set forth in various classes of texts, which perhaps may best be contemplated when thrown into groups. But do not forget to observe in what immense variety of phraseology these statements are conveyed; a copiousness and intensity which far outstrip all human modes of statement on the subject.\* Among these declarations we find—

1. Passages which hold out the offer of eternal life as *peculiar to the righteous*,—a restricted offer. Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.—Being made free from sin and become the servants of God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.—To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for honor and glory and immortality, [God will give] eternal life.—They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever.—He that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal.—Jesus saith unto

---

\* In delivering this lecture, the author read the passages from Whittemore's Guide, in the order in which they are quoted there to be assailed; and was unable to read more than half for want of time. In printing, it was thought more convenient for the reader to group the texts. They by no means exhaust the subject.

him, Sell whatsoever thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven.—And Jesus answered and said, Verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive a hundred-fold now in this time, [this present time—*Luke*,] houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come, eternal life.—And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.—Jesus saith unto them, I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water, springing up into everlasting life.—He that believeth shall be saved.—Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.—The righteous shall go into life eternal.—Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord.—To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God.—For I say unto you that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.—Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven.—Verily I say unto thee except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.\*

---

\* 1 Tim. 4: 8. Rom. 6: 22; 2: 7. Dan. 12: 3. John 4: 36.—Matt. 19: 21. Mark 10: 29, 30. Heb. 5: 9. John 7: 35; 4: 14. Acts 16: 31. Matt. 25: 46. Rev. 14: 13; 2: 7. Matt. 5: 20; 18: 3. John 3: 3.

Such is the invariable representation of God's word. Its promises of future blessedness are all restricted to the righteous, to believers in Christ.

2. Passages of Scripture which describe the future states of men in contrast.

Men of the world which have their portion in this life: I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness.—The hope of the righteous shall be gladness; but the expectation of the wicked shall perish.—The wicked is driven away in his wickedness; but the righteous hath hope in his death.—Say ye to the righteous, it shall be well with him; for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him, for the reward of his hands shall be given him.—And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.—He will gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.—Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat; because strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.—Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.—Many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.—The field is the world; the tares are the children of the wicked



one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world;—as therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.—The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which when it was full they drew to the shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world. The angels shall come forth and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.—Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord. And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.—Blessed is that servant whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing; verily I say unto you that he shall make him ruler over all his goods. But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to smite his fellow servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of; and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.—Then shall

the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.—He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.—He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.—The rich man also died and was buried, and in hell he lifted up his eyes being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.... And Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted and thou art tormented. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you, can not; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.—The hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.—What if God, willing to show his wrath and make his power known, endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction; and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory?—Be not deceived: God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to

the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption ; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting.—That which beareth thorns and briers, is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing ; whose end is to be burned. But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak.—For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God ; and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God ? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear ? —Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.—He that overcometh shall inherit all things ; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone ; which is the second death.—He that is unjust let him be unjust still ; and he which is filthy let him be filthy still ; and he that is righteous let him be righteous still ; and he that is holy let him be holy still.\*

### 3. Passages which announce a final judgment upon

---

\* Ps. 17 : 14, 15. Prov. 10 : 28, 14, 32. Is. 3 : 10, 11. Dan. 12 : 2. Matt. 3 : 12 ; 7 : 13, 14 ; 7 : 21 ; 8 : 11, 12 ; 13 : 38—43 ; 13 : 47—50 ; 25 : 23 ; 24 : 46—51 ; 25 : 34, 41, 46. Mark 16 : 16. John 3 : 36.—Luke 16 : 22, 23, 25, 26. John 5 : 28, 29. Rom. 9 : 22, 23. Gal. 6 : 7, 8. Heb. 6 : 8, 9. 1 Pet. 4 : 17, 18. Rev. 22 : 14, 15 ; 21 : 7, 8 : 22 : 11.

the righteous and the wicked, to decide their doom. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.—It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment.—Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that Man whom he hath ordained.—I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the book, according to their works.—For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ; for it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, Every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then, every one of us shall give account of himself to God.—He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day.—The heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.—For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law: . . . in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.—Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts.—Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.—Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you;

and to you, who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.—When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.... And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.\*

4. Passages which speak of the endless duration of future punishment, positively, by the terms, “everlasting, eternal, for ever, forever and ever.”

It is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire.—Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.—And these shall go away into everlasting punishment.—He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness but is in danger of eternal damnation.—Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.—The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.—These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest, to whom the

---

\* 2 Cor. 5: 10. Heb. 9: 27. Acts 17: 31. Rev. 20: 12. Rom. 14: 10—12. John 12: 48. 2 Peter 3: 7. Rom. 2: 12, 16. 1 Cor. 4: 5. Matt. 12: 36. 2 Thess. 1: 6—8. Matt. 25: 31, 32, 46.

mist of darkness is reserved forever.—Wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever.—If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever.—And they said, “Alleluia!” and her smoke rose up forever and ever.—And the devil that deceived them was cast into a lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night, forever and ever.\*

5. Passages which by the use of negative terms declare the punishment of the wicked to be endless.

The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men, neither in this world nor in the world to come.—He hath never forgiveness but is in danger of eternal damnation.—He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.—If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.—Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the

---

\* Matt. 18:8; 25:41, 46. Mark 3:29. 2 Thess. 1:9. Jude, 6. 2 Peter 2:17. Jude, 13. Rev. 14:9—11; 19:3; 20:10.



kingdom of God.—Now the works of the flesh are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings and such like, of the which I tell you before, as I have told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.—Where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.—And there shall in no wise enter into it [the new Jerusalem] anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie.—Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God ?\*

6. Passages which in various forms assert or imply the utter ruin of the wicked hereafter.

Woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed!—It had been good for that man if he had not been born.—Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.—I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear. Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him.—What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose himself or be cast away.—Ye serpents! ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell?—From which Judas by transgression fell that he might go to his own place.—The preaching of the cross is, unto them that

---

\* Matt. 12:31, 32. Mark 3:29. John 3:36. Heb. 10:26, 27. 1 Cor. 6:9, 10. Gal. 5:19—21. Heb. 12:14. Mark 9:44, 46, 48. Rev. 21:27. 1 Cor. 6:9.

perish, foolishness.—For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish. To the one we are the savor of death unto death ; and to the other the savor of life unto life.—But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption.—But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasureth up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds ; to them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for honor and glory, and immortality, eternal life ; but unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile.\*

7. Passages which limit the time of preparation for heaven, and which teach that the punishment of some men is remediless.

Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.—Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me, and of my words in this evil and adulterous generation, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels.—While ye have the light, believe in the light that ye may be children of the light.—Behold now is the accepted time ; behold now is the day of salvation.—Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God.—

---

\* Matt. 26 : 24 ; 10 : 28. Luke 12 : 5 ; 9 : 25. Matt. 23 : 33. Acts 1 : 17. Rev. 1 : 18. 2 Cor. 2 : 16. 2 Peter 2 : 12. Rom. 2 : 5 — 9.

Then said one unto him, Lord, are there few that be saved? and he said unto him, Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many I say unto you, shall seek to enter in and shall not be able. When once the Master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without and to knock at the door saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence you are; depart from me, ye workers of iniquity. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.—While they [the foolish virgins] went to buy, the bridgroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage, and the door was shut.—Because I have called and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded.....I also will laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh. When your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish come upon you; then shall they call upon me but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but shall not find me.—He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; he that is filthy let him be filthy still.\*

Such are some of the varied forms in which the word of God sets forth the fearful fact of a final retribution. Well might the infidel reply to the Universalist preacher, “It is of no use to talk in that way; the Bible is full of hell and every body knows it.” And the thoughtful reader will inquire, “If these dec-

---

\* Matt. 10: 33. Mark 8: 38. John 12: 36. 2 Cor. 6: 2. Heb. 12: 15. Luke 13: 23 — 28. Matt. 25: 10. Prov. 1: 24 — 28. Rev. 22: 11.

larations do not announce the doctrine of future, remediless punishment to the wicked, what forms of human speech can set it forth?" Hearer, can you devise modes of expression more varied and explicit!

And how now can men proceed to take off the edge from such terrific language? You may well suppose it a Sisyphean toil—the restless rolling of the same refractory stone—the ceaseless filling of the same leaky vessel. The Universalist pulpit perpetually creaks, and their press groans, with their uneasy labors to break down the plain word of God. To these refractory passages, Mr. Whittemore's Plain Guide, for example, devotes a hundred and ninety pages, and refers his reader to some thirty or forty other discussions of many hundred pages more.

The process is pitiful. The writers assume in the outset, that God's character is incompatible with eternal punishment, and that any affirmation of such punishment must, at all events, be explained away. They dare not gaze on the simple scripture statements. Their examination of scripture testimony, (in their printed volumes,) is invariably preceded by protracted arguments, designed to abate the force of scripture testimony, and explain it away. You must not look, till they have mounted their juggler's apparatus; and then when you look for the character of God, they show you the heart of a Universalist.

These writers distinctly avow their settled determination to bend the scripture to their views. "Love," says Williamson in his preliminary discussion, "is the very essence, the life and soul of the gospel, and *I am prepared to reject any and every doctrine and practice*

as anti-christian, that is opposed to this all pervading spirit of love." Says H. Ballou, "Moreover, we feel it to be a duty to state that in room of straining particular passages which speak of the punishment of the wicked, so as to favor the idea of unlimited punishment, *we should feel justified in restraining any passage*, could such be found, which should seem to favor an opinion so dishonorable to God and *so revolting to our best feelings*." Moore informs us that "we should carefully exclude from our credenda every principle that stands opposed in its nature or tendency to love." Whittemore deliberately tells us that the word "everlasting," "when applied to punishment, ought *above every other case*, to bear the sense of limited duration."\*

This is sufficiently distinct and intelligible. And you now see why these men cannot find future punishment in God's word; they are "prepared to reject any and every doctrine" necessary, they "feel justified in restraining any passage" requisite, they can "carefully exclude from their credenda "every principle" they find "opposed" to them, they choose in the threats of punishment, "above every other case," to restrict the words of the Lord God.

Here you read the grand maxim of Universalism — *tampering with the word of God*. Here you see the signal of their truceless war with its plain statements. Here you have the secret of that rasping and hammering and wrenching, to which, from end to end, the scripture is subjected, till the most awful phrases and

---

\* End. Pun. Ex., p. 5. Lect. Sermon., p. 193, Un. Bel., p. 93, Plain Guide, p. 198.

terrific threats are emptied of all meaning. It would seem hardly necessary to give examples; for no man after weighing those scripture declarations, can fail to feel that any process by which they are made consistent with modern Universalism, must do violence to all the powers of language. Still, the exposure would be incomplete, without specimens of the method. I will cite them chiefly from one volume—the Plain Guide of Mr. Whittemore.\*

Now begins the pulverizing process. “Everlasting punishment,” “everlasting chains,” “vengeance of eternal fire,” “unquenchable fire,” “the smoke of torment ascending forever and ever,” and the like, never mean everlasting, eternal, forever; always limited duration, “temporal judgments” (p. 190). “Eternal damnation” is “the judgment of the age,” (p. 134); “eternal judgment” is “a judgment long past, an ancient judgment,” (p. 196). “Shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come,” and “hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation” means, “shall not be forgiven in the age of Christ, nor the age that succeeds” (p. 101).

And thus the terms, which throughout the Bible,

---

\* My reasons for dealing chiefly with this book in the Scripture argument, are several: necessary limitation and the desire of definiteness; the willingness to show how much rottenness is concentrated in a *single* Universalist book; the prominence of its author, for quarter of a century editor of the Trumpet, and a noted champion and representative of Universalism; the plan of his book, more ambitious and complete in its way, than any I have found; its wide circulation, amounting in 1851 to ten or twelve thousand, (if I rightly remember the statement in the “Universalist Pulpit”) which has probably given it a greater influence in forming New England Universalism, than that of any other volume.



invariably denote the longest possible duration of which their subject is capable, and the particular Greek term which in the New Testament is never elsewhere applied to *limited* future time, but is used of God and his glory, of Christ and his kingdom, and more than fifty times to describe the happiness of the righteous—this word “everlasting,” the moment it touches the punishment of the wicked, is suddenly emptied of its meaning.\*

---

\* Universalists make much parade of a few instances in which the Hebrew term for “everlasting” designates something less than absolute eternity, as the “everlasting hills.” But the phrase, when applied to future time, always denotes the longest duration of which its subject is capable. “Everlasting hills” are those which will continue to the end of the world. “He shall serve forever,” i. e. during the longest period of which he is capable, his whole life. Hannah devoted Samuel to the Lord “forever;” he was never to return to private life. “An ordinance forever” is one which lasts through the longest possible time, i. e. the whole dispensation of which it is a part. Such cases, few in number, do not contravene in spirit the scores of instances in which it signifies absolute eternity—the *original and proper sense of the term*.

The Greek adjective translated everlasting, ( *αἰώνιος* ) when applied to future duration, in all cases (excepting for the time its application to punishment) denotes *an endless period*. It is used sixty-six times; twice in relation to God and his glory; fifty-one times concerning the happiness of the righteous; six times of miscellaneous subjects, but with the plain signification, endless; and seven times concerning future punishment. (Stuart's Essays, p. 47.) The phrase translated “forever,” ( *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, and the plural form, ) uniformly denotes, “endless duration,” and is employed sixty-one times, *six of which relate to future punishment*. The phrase “forever and ever,” ( *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων* ) also invariably denotes endless duration. It occurs twenty-one times, eighteen of which relate to the continuance of the perfections, glory, government and praise of God; one to the happiness of the righteous; and two to future punishment. Plain men can understand such facts. (Stuart's Essays on Fut. Pun., p. 36.) Hahn's edition of the Greek Testament contains six other instances of the word, making no change in the state of the case.

This is but a beginning. Every troublesome phrase and passage is dispatched in the same summary way. To "perish," "consume," "be destroyed," is simply "to fail, sink, be overcome, be driven away, be disappointed, be slain in battle" (p. 66). "*Shall* be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment," means that it *was* more tolerable ages ago (p. 91). "*Shall not* see life," signifies the *present* consequence of unbelief, is not now in a state of life (p. 160). "To sleep in the dust of the earth," denotes "a state of natural indolence and sloth" (p. 75); "coming forth from the graves," denotes "a change in the temporal affairs of men," but never a resurrection to immortality; and when accompanying the statement that the good shall come forth "to the resurrection of life," and they that have done evil "to the resurrection of damnation," it "*furnishes proof*" that this resurrection is not "the immortal resurrection!!" (p. 162). The "kingdom of heaven" from which the wicked are excluded, is not *heaven*—it is the reign of the gospel in this world (p. 88); and in all cases where similar statements are made, it ceases to be in the future world. To "have an hundred fold now in this time, and in the world to come eternal life," is to have an hundred fold "under the law," and "in the age of the gospel" to have abundant peace of mind and greater outward peace than ever before" (p. 142). To "see the Lord," in the stern declaration "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," refers only "to a state of spiritual honor and enjoyment in the present life" (p. 208). "The angels who kept not their first estate, reserved in everlasting chains

under darkness unto the judgment of the great day," are "ministers who kept not their proper offices, who were doomed to darkness of mind," and who suffered at the destruction of Jerusalem ( p. 218 ). "Everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power," denotes "the banishment of the Jews from their own land ( p. 192 ). "The heavens and the earth fleeing away before the face of Him" which sat upon the throne, is the passing away of the Jewish religion ( p. 240 ). "Hell" is the grave, the valley of Hinnom ( p. 82 ), and sometimes "a low, depressed, debased situation" ( p. 96 ). "The broad way that leads to death," is simply the path of folly ( p. 85 ). "Outer darkness" with "weeping and gnashing of teeth," so often declared to be the portion of evil-doers, is "a state of ignorance and unbelief" of the gospel ( p. 88 ). "Many will seek to enter in" at the strait gate, "and shall not be able," was fulfilled when Jerusalem was destroyed, and the Jews ceased to enjoy gospel privileges ( p. 192 ). "Ye shall die in your sins,"—shall "as a nation be dissolved for the sin of rejecting the Messiah" ( p. 164 ). "What must I do to be saved?"—what must I do "to become one of your number?" ( p. 174 ). "The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God," means, substantially, that unrighteousness shall not inherit the kingdom of God ( p. 182 ). The "fearful thing, to fall into the hands of the living God," was to suffer at the destruction of Jerusalem ( p. 206 ). The proposition, "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment," by a species of legerdemain peculiar to Universalism, is transmuted thus: It is appointed

unto the Jewish high priests every year to offer a bloody sacrifice, after which they and the people obtained ceremonial justification ( p. 201—2 ).\* Christ's solemn description of the last judgment " when the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, and before him shall be gathered all nations," is "*a parable*" ( p. 170 ); Judas, as we have seen, was a genuine penitent ( p. 134 ); and it was not Judas, but his successor, who was to " go to his own place " ( p. 170 ).

There is one grand resort when all else fails, and when the language of Scripture becomes too appalling to be trifled with; and that is to refer it to the destruction of Jerusalem. No matter how incongruous—no matter for the Savior's own explanation to the contrary—this is the great common sewer of Universalist interpretation. " The last day " at which

---

\* This marvellous piece of interpretation, it seems, was invented by Hosea Ballou, Sen., when he had been preaching twenty-seven years, and it made him, as we may well suppose it would, " exceeding glad." It is adopted by Cobb ( Compend, p. 136 ), by Williamson ( Exposit., p. 119 ), and quite extensively by the denomination.

Hosea Ballou has evidently a natural genius for such feats. Thus he takes the passage, Mal. 4 : 1, " For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, all that do wickedly shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch," and, after a series of passes upon it, he actually pronounces " the true meaning of the text " to be that all the proud, all they that do wickedly " shall be translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son." Lect. Ser., p. 96. I will let the reader guess the process.

Whittemore has not attained such illumination; he contents himself with his usual pastime of destroying the Jews: " That the destruction of the Jews is set forth under the figure of *burning*, is too palpably true to need confirmation." Plain Guide, p. 77.

Christ's word should judge his rejectors, is the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 168). When the guest without the wedding garment was to be bound hand and foot, and cast into outer darkness where is weeping and gnashing of teeth, it is the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 117). When the wicked at the end of the world are to be gathered by Christ's angels and cast into the furnace of fire, that is the destruction of Jerusalem. The punishment of the unfaithful servant whom his Lord appointed to a portion with the hypocrites—that of the servant who hid his Lord's money—are the destruction of Jerusalem. “The damnation of hell,” is the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 118). The exclusion of the foolish virgins, is the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 122); and the watching of the wise was their watching for the Roman armies (p. 168). “The wrath to come,” is the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 78). “Wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds,” is the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 178). “Jesus Christ revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power”—is the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 189). The “fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries,” is the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 205). The second death, and the being cast into the lake of fire, took place at the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 222). The dead,



small and great, summoned before Him that sat on the throne, experienced this at the destruction of Jerusalem. The Son of Man sitting on his throne, gathering all nations before him, severing them and pronouncing their doom, while these "go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal"—took place at the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 240). The "holy angels" who should gather all nations before the Savior, are Roman armies (p. 104);—heathen soldiers, the armies that Christ termed "the abomination of desolation," converted by Mr. Whittemore into "holy angels!"

Almost the crowning absurdity of all, is the statement, put forth not only by this writer, but in some form by all the writers of the system, that the inflictions of these fearful threatenings are but the "wise, necessary, salutary ministrations of a father's kindness," expressions of "tenderness and love" towards those on whom they are inflicted. Think of the combination, thus: "O cursed children, which have forsaken the right way, I will pour out my fury upon you, I will take vengeance in flaming fire on you. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell? I will render to you indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, with everlasting destruction from my presence and the glory of my power; I will cast you into the lake of fire, and the smoke of your torment shall ascend up forever and ever; and you shall never have forgiveness;—and I will do all this unto you, O children of wrath, as an expression of a father's tenderness and love for you."—Can anything be more horribly absurd? Does it not make one shudder to hear such delirious assertions?



In connexion with all this weakness is found a course of singular unfairness and inconsistency, rising from petty quibbles and equivocations up to what it is hard to believe less than downright dishonesty. Such paltry evasions as this are common: When Christ solemnly warns his disciples not to fear those “who kill [actually kill] the body,” but to “fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell,” Mr. Whittemore asks, “Does it say God *will* destroy both soul and body in hell? No; it says he is able to do so,”—and he denies not only that God will do it, but even that there was any danger of his doing it (p. 92). That is, he makes Christ solemnly “forewarn” them, not in the least to fear those who could and would deprive them of life itself, but to fear him who would in no conceivable circumstances harm them—to fear him of whom there was nothing to fear—yea, to fear that he would, “*after he had killed,*” (for this is the phrase of Luke) destroy soul and body in a place, which, according to Mr. Whittemore, has no existence! One form of quibbling, is to deny the future-state reference of certain statements, because the phraseology contains, as it must, idioms of this world. When ceaseless suffering is described, in the language of common life, as the having no rest “day nor night,” Whittemore and his compeers insist upon it that this phrase proves their suffering to be in this world, where the change of day and night takes place; though the last words preceding are, “the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever” (p. 237). So in Christ’s tale of the rich man and Lazarus, though we are distinctly informed that each had died, and the one was in Abraham’s

bosom, the other in hell, being in torments, it is contended that this could not be in the other world because the parties have "bodies, eyes, ears, fingers; they converse, they reason, they see each other;"—a principle on which we ought to deny the spiritual nature of God himself, because he speaks, in the language of men, of his eye, ear, finger, hand and arm—reasons, converses and sees. In one part of his volume we find him framing half-a-dozen arguments by quoting the promise, "in thee and thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed," and insisting that "all nations" must mean every son and daughter of Adam in all lands and times; and then, in the gathering of all nations before the Son of Man, making "all nations" comprise the comparative handful who lived at the destruction of Jerusalem and were implicated in that event.

A favorite device of a paltry kind, is to inquire why a statement found in one gospel is not in all the gospels; when one word is employed, why not some other; when a term is used a certain number of times, and that perhaps a large number, why not still more abundant. Thus, why did not Christ say "destroy *spirit* and body," rather than soul and body (p. 95); and Mr. Whittemore distinctly endeavors to make the impression, *which is false*,\* that the word "*soul*" (ψυχή) does not, in the New Testament, denote the immortal spirit. And when Christ says "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead . . . shall be equal unto the angels,"—because the phrase "accounted worthy," etc., is found in Luke

---

\* See Robinson's Lex., Art. "ψυχή."

and not in Matthew and Mark, he actually argues that "the weight is as two to one against the importance of the words" (p. 155). And when the word Gehenna, "hell," a word employed in the Savior's time to denote the place of future punishment, is found as many as *twelve times* in the New Testament, he inquires if it is "not a little singular" that it occurs no more (p. 81). He argues that there is no future retribution, because, as he says, when the resurrection is mentioned, retribution is not also mentioned in the same passage; and when retribution, then not the resurrection;—and when we bring passages (like John 5:28, 29; Heb. 6:2) where resurrection and retribution are joined in the most solemn manner, then we are met with the astounding assertion that the very statement, "*they that are in their graves shall come forth*" to the resurrection of life and the resurrection of damnation, "*furnishes proof*" that the immortal resurrection was not intended!! (p. 162.)

Recklessness of means is characteristic. Mr. Whittemore is willing to convey the impression that "soul" does not mean the immortal spirit in the New Testament, and that the term Gehenna (hell) was not applied by the Jews in the time of Christ to denote the place of future punishment (pp. 93, 94). He boldly declares that "all writers agree" to one of his assertions, (p. 82,) when some of the most learned men, like Dr. Robinson, deny that there is any evidence for the assertion.\* Now he confirms an interpretation

---

\* That the valley of Hinnom became a place of punishment, where criminals were caused to suffer death by burning. Fires to devour offal were kindled there in the time of King Josiah; and modern writers, like

with, "so say the best commentators" (p. 25,); when as matter of fact the reader will not be able to find one who "so says."

Every kind of device is unscrupulously adopted to bring some seeming support of these evasions. Universalist and Unitarian authorities are mixed up with evangelical ones, the latter mostly of a by-gone age and scholarship. Every species of aid is eagerly invoked, down to the eccentric translation of Wakefield, and the Douay version of the Roman Catholics. One frequent resort is to catch at whatever peculiar view may be found with individuals of the immense number of evangelical expositors, and somewhat triumphantly to exhibit it either as an admission of orthodoxy or as a justification of the view; not a little as though the Universalist preacher should frame his code of morals by looking to Jacob for falsehood, to David for adultery, to Paul and Barnabas for contention, and to Peter for cursing and swearing, with an occasional embellishment from the lives of Jezebel and Jeroboam.

But there are graver doings than these. To break the force of the exclusive promises of the scriptures, as

Stuart, have supposed, without proof, they were kept burning in the time of Christ; but, to the contrary, see Robinson's Lex., Art. "*γέεννα*;" also Royce on Universalism, pp. 23, 24, quoted by Rev. N. D. George, p. 242, etc. The latter writer has shown at large the glaring mis-statements and deceptive concealments of Universalists in regard to this matter, continued to the present day. Even Whittemore is constrained to admit (p. 43,) that the Jews of Christ's time "are well known to have believed in endless punishment;" while there is evidence aside from the Bible, that "*Gehenna*" was the special designation of that place of punishment.

already mentioned, the unhappy man in his straits avers that the phrase "eternal life is not used by the sacred writers to signify endless blessedness beyond the grave," but peace in this world; and yet in the same volume deliberately advances three several arguments, founded solely on the use of this phrase, to prove the endless blessedness of all men beyond the grave.\* At one time two passages of John's Revelation, regarding the lake of fire, the second death and the punishment of liars and other wicked men, are referred to the destruction of Jerusalem; in another part of the same volume, a verse is taken out of the same description, midway between these two, and four verses from each, to prove the blessedness of all men in heaven.† In one place when his argument requires it, he distinctly asserts that Christ will "come down" and "visit the earth again bodily *at the resurrection* of the dead;" in all other portions of his book, as his necessities require, he refuses to recognize any such "coming of Christ—it "took place during the apostolic age."‡ When a man does such things, can he do

---

\* P. 140, and 25, 46, 52.

† Pp. 223, 227, 243, and p. 53. Allusion has been made to these cases, and others like them, elsewhere; but I willingly, by repeated reference, call distinct attention to these characteristic procedures of Universalism. Let the honest adherents of the system see what "Guides" they follow.

‡ P. 36. "He had ascended into the heavens bodily; the heavens would contain him till the times of the restitution; and then he would bodily visit the earth again. Now when shall he visit the earth again bodily? Answer, At the resurrection of the dead." On the other hand, see pp. 124, 125, 185, 186, 189—192. "The coming of the Lord took place, as we have said, during the apostolic age." "The coming of the Son of Man with his angels, took place during the natural lives of some of the generation then on earth." P. 189.

it in ignorance? And can he be an honest teacher of God's truth?

Such is the course of treatment that fills two hundred pages with its worryings of the word of God. I have not tried to answer it. I have only set it naked before you. Fairly before you, I am willing to leave them both—the majestic, clear, and awful voice of God, declaring the eternal doom of the unrepentant sinner—and these poor pitiful perversions, and contemptible evasions.

My hearers, you have heard for yourselves the statements of God's own mouth. You can judge whether they have any meaning. If they do not affirm the most fearful vengeance of God—if they do not declare the eternal punishment of the wicked, how, let me appeal to yourselves, how can language be so framed as to declare it? Can you invent more intense or varied phraseology? If this language can be broken down, could not any forms into which language can be wrought, be also set aside? Nay, do not the first principles which Universalism lays down, necessitate the crushing out of future punishment from the word of God, at all hazards? As specimens of interpretation, are not these constructions which I have quoted, equally despicable in themselves, and insulting to the word of God? Do they not ascribe to God a recklessness and even swaggering of speech, such as is to be found only among the lowest class of men—the ungodly and profane? And must not the hope of eternal life, which rests only on the expectation of finding the whole Bible a tissue of inflated exaggerations, and



gross extravagances of speech, sporting with the fears of the great mass of men in all ages,—of finding a lie in the mouth of God, and the truth in the mouth of such interpreters as these—must it not be the frailest of all broken reeds, perishing like the spider's web at the giving up of the ghost !

I have read of one who hung down a precipice, sustained by a single strand of a parting cord—of one cast forth in mid-ocean on a solitary plank—and of one who was seen floating in a slender skiff on the brink of Niagara, and straining every sinew till it was ready to snap, in the struggle against that fearful current ;—and I think their prospects cheering, and hopeful even, beside his whose only hope of heaven rests on turning back the dreadful tide of eternal wrath that heaves, and foams, and dashes, through the word of the living God. “The water shall overflow their hiding-place—their covenant with death shall be disannulled, and their agreement with hell shall not stand.”

---

## LECTURE FOURTH.

### THE UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT, AFFIRMATIVE. SCRIPTURE CITATIONS.

Matthew IV : 5, 6, 7. Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down ; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee ; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

The arch-enemy of souls could not only deny, for the ruin of our great ancestor, the plainest teachings of God ; he even quoted Scripture to our Savior, to cut off the only hope of a ruined race.

In the preceding discourse, I exposed the attempts of Universalists to break down those Scriptures which speak of future punishment—a rock against which they ceaselessly beat, and fall in spray. I quoted, without comment, a portion of that appalling array of Scripture testimony ; I showed you, from standard Universalist writers, the avowed determination to destroy all such testimony ; and gave you specimens, quoting volume and page, of the absurd and sometimes dishonest methods in which that determination is carried out. I now proceed to consider,

II. The attempt to bring Scripture proof for the doctrine of Universal Salvation.

The passages of Scripture adduced by Universalists to sustain their system are usually very few indeed. Sometimes they adopt a more ambitious course ; and then the texts are mostly of the following kinds : First, certain passages which declare God's love, mercy, or parental goodness, only, and say not a word on the question at issue ; passages, therefore, utterly irrelevant, but which they attempt to force into their service by an inference ;—being a merciful God, say they, he will not punish forever. Secondly, certain passages which speak of the greatness of Christ's work, or the sufficiency of his atonement, but which have no bearing on the question whether all the individuals of the human race will avail themselves of it, and be saved by it ; passages, moreover, which *they* are wholly precluded from using, because they distinctly deny that Christ came to save men from any other evils than those of the present life. Thirdly, certain passages which speak of the spread of the gospel through the earth. Fourthly, certain passages which teach the universal *dominion* of God and Christ over willing subjects and *conquered rebels* ; and which they assume, against the express statements of Scripture, to be only over willing subjects. Fifthly, a few passages descriptive of the final state and blessedness of the righteous, which they violently wrench from their connexion and apply to all men.

There may be a few passages not covered by this description ; but it comprises the great mass of their Scripture references, at their utmost extent. Most of them have palpably no reference to final happiness in heaven, and scarcely a dozen have any appearance of

it. In truth, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Williamson and Mr. Moore, cautiously abstain from the attempt to adduce more than six or eight passages of scripture to this point, and some of these wide of the mark. They prefer to rest the case chiefly on general reasoning,—reasonings of their own. This, indeed, is the more ordinary range of the Universalist argument.

Mr. Whittemore, however, is more ambitious, if not more wise ; and he attempts to manufacture a “ hundred arguments ” from the scriptures, in favor of the final holiness and happiness of all men. These arguments, after having been some years in circulation, were retouched by their author to his satisfaction, and incorporated in the stereotype edition of his Plain Guide. To show you how desperate and forlorn is this most ambitious of attempts to frame “ scripture arguments,” I will follow him somewhat closely through.\* And I think you will observe as I proceed, that the wrenching process is quite as violent in its endeavors to force the final happiness of all men into these passages, as in its labor to expel the doctrine of future punishment from the class we have already considered.

The chapter is entitled :

*“What evidences do Universalists adduce from the scriptures in support of their belief in the eventual holiness and happiness of all men?”*

“Evidence from the Scriptures,” is the word ; so let

---

\* This course will at the same time meet the Scripture quotations of the other writers, which are all included in Mr. Whittemore’s greater display.

it be. Not inferences, not declamations about what God *must do*, because he is so good and wise — and so on ; but what he *says* he will do—not what Mr. Whittemore says, but what God says. See, then, after the great champion has ransacked the Bible, and remodelled and stereotyped his argument, let us see what he brings us.

Argument No. 1 contains this text of scripture, “He hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on the face of all the earth.” Mr. Whittemore has indeed added half a page of Universalist talk about God’s “benevolence,” but we are listening for scripture and not Whittemore, and here is the solitary scripture. And what does it teach ? Simply the common origin of the whole human family. Of their destiny here or hereafter, not a word, not a shadow of an implication. So vanishes number one.

Number 2 is like unto it. “Have we not all one Father ? Hath not one God created us ?” Certainly ; a most important truth ; but having no more reference to final salvation, than to infant baptism.

Number 3. “Behold all souls are mine, saith the Lord ; as the soul of the father so also the soul of the son is mine.” “The earth is the Lord’s and the fulness thereof ; the world and they that dwell therein.” That is to say, God is the owner of all men and all things : how he will dispose of them, we learn elsewhere—those who refuse to acknowledge his authority, he will punish.

Number 4. “Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession” (Ps. 2 : 8.) “The

Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into his hand" (John 3:35). The first of these passages declares the spread of Christ's gospel and power through this earth; the very next verse asserting that *his enemies he will break with a rod of iron*, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel,"—a verse which Mr. W. discreetly omits to quote. The other verse, as the sentence before it shows, simply declares the commitment of all gifts and grace into Christ's hands; or the investment of him with all qualifications and authority for the fulfilment of his mission, as when he says, "All power is given unto me in heaven and earth." This verse also stands in a connexion most unfortunate for Universalism. The next verse reads thus: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son *shall not see life*, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

Number 5. "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." Precisely so: he will give eternal life to those very persons whom the Father hath given him; and to no more.

Number 6. "All that the Father hath given me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." A precious assurance indeed, to "*those who come*" unto Christ; "he will in no wise cast out." But alas for the multitude that will not come.

Now, as the passages separately contain no intimation of Universal salvation, the author tries a little legerdemain upon them. Two of these detached passages he joins together, deliberately perverts the first



of them, seasons the perversion with an untruth, and then draws out Universalism from the mixture.—Thus: “The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands;” “All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out.” Says Mr. W., “‘all things’ here means all intelligent beings. So say the best commentators.” He sums up thus: “All are given; all shall come; none shall be cast out.” Now, all this is founded on the most reckless assumptions. First, the glaring and monstrous perversion that “all *things*” here means all *intelligent beings*, neither more nor less; for if it include anything more, or if it mean anything different, as it unquestionably does, such as all power, authority, fulness, grace, gifts, or blessings, the argument is absurd. Another gross sophistry is the assumption that if “*things*” were intelligent beings, they could be given into the Savior’s hands or subjected to his authority, only for the purpose of saving them;—an assumption contradicted in the very verse that follows—“He that believeth not on the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.” Conscious of weakness, Mr. Whittemore tries to strengthen his position with brass: “So say the best commentators,” he avers. Whereas, if you can find a solitary commentator who so says, you will be more successful than I have been. Even a brother Universalist has rebuked him for this perversion and untruth.\*

---

\* Rev. W. R. French, in the Gospel Banner, Aug. 5, 1844, (quoted by N. D. George,) writes thus: “This is a favorite text with some to prove our doctrine. But does it have the least, the faintest reference to it? Do not ‘all things’ denote the power given to Christ, or every-

I have explained these passages seriously as they deserve. Still I ought to remind you that for Mr. Whittemore to adduce these passages concerning Christ's work and eternal life, in proof of final salvation, is in him a trick, a double trick; for he informs us (on p. 140), that the phrase "eternal life" "is not used by the sacred writers to signify endless blessedness beyond the grave," and (on pp. 253 and 254) that "the evils from which Jesus came to save men are in this world."

Number 7 contains a text which is constantly heard from the advocates of Universalism: "Who will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth?" 1 Tim. 2: 4. Universalists insist upon it that this expresses God's absolute determination. But is it so? No. The very language employed, refutes them. It simply expresses God's benevolent desire, not his irresistible will. The phrase "will have" is, in the original, simply *wishes* or *desires*, and commonly so translated in the New Testament. Thus, Luke 8: 20, "Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, *desiring* to see thee." It is sometimes differently translated, but with the same meaning; thus, Matt.

---

thing necessary for the accomplishment of his work? Does not the context require this explanation? And yet a certain book (*Guide*, p. 25,) has it that 'all things' here means all intelligent *beings*. So say the best commentators.' These best commentators are beyond our knowledge; yet enough are at hand to bear a contrary testimony."—And Mr. French cites against it, "Scott, Clarke, Campbell, Bloomfield, Livermore, Tholuck;" Mr. George adds, "Henry, Benson, Wesley." To these may be added, Calvin, Barnes, Rosenmuller, Kuinoel, Olshanssen, De Wette, and Jacobus. Such is the honesty of a Universalist champion.

15: 28, "O woman, great is thy faith, be it unto thee even as thou *wilt*," i. e. desirest. Every person who has the slightest knowledge of the Greek language, knows that here the words of the original\* would be exactly given thus: "Who wishes all men to be saved." The text expresses, therefore, God's benevolent desire or disposition, as when he says, "O that thou hadst hearkened unto my commandments;" and when Christ wept over Jerusalem, and said, "How often *would* I [willed, or desired—for it is the same word as before] have gathered your children together, *and ye would not*. Behold your house is left unto you desolate." To assert, therefore, that the text before us declares God's determination, or irresistible will, is doing open violence to the words which Paul wrote. But God's merciful disposition, his desire that all men might be saved, is wonderfully displayed in the whole plan of redemption, and the invitations of the gospel; yet multitudes clearly do not come to a knowledge of the truth,—and reject his salvation. "*Ye will not come unto me*," said Christ, "that ye might have life."†

Arguments No. 8, 9, 10, 11, have no bearing whatever on the question of final salvation, but refer to the general theological doctrine that God's will, or settled determination, is to be accomplished. The Scriptures quoted are these: in No. 8, "thy will be done;" "I exhort therefore that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men." No. 9, "My meat is to do the will of him that

---

\* The words are, *θέλει σωθῆναι*.

† I waive the questions, whether "all men" here means all individuals, or all classes of men; and whether "saved" here refers to final salvation.

sent me, and to finish his work.” “Lo I come to do thy will, O God.” No. 10: “He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand or say unto him what doest thou?” No. 11: “He is in one mind, and who can turn him?”

Now, none of us doubts that God’s determination, the fixed decisions of his will, are surely to be accomplished. *The question is*, has God absolutely determined that all men shall be saved? And these general quotations about God’s will being accomplished, have no more to do with that question, than with the return of the Jews to the Holy Land. They require no comment.

Number 12 quotes two passages, one describing one of God’s attributes, the other the rule of Christian intercourse among men. The first is “God is love;” the second, “love worketh no ill to his neighbor.”—Mr. W., however, omits the last three words, in order that the passage may seem to be a description of God’s dealings; and probably having confidence that his readers would never discover the omission. But separately or together, these passages do not touch the question of final salvation.

Number 13 contains this part of a sentence (John 3: 16), “For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son;”—here Mr. W. arrests the quotation. I will merely finish the sentence, and leave him to make the most of it. “For God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”

No. 14 contains an allusion to the passage, (Luke 6 : 35,) where our heavenly Father is spoken of as being kind to the unthankful and evil ; i. e., as it is given more fully in Matt. 5 : 45, “ he causeth his sun to rise on them, and sendeth rain on them,” in this life. No shadow of reference to a future life. All this, alas, will then be changed.

No. 15 asserts that God is wise, but quotes no scripture except that piece of a sentence, “ love worketh no ill.”

No. 16 takes James 3 : 17, a verse that describes the “ wisdom from above” in a pious man, culls out of the whole verse, the two phrases, “ full of mercy” and “ without partiality” or *wrangling*, and applies them to God ;—and then *infers* the doctrine of Universal Salvation.

No. 17. “ As I live,” saith the Lord God, “ I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked.” Yes, “ no *pleasure*” in it, he says,—just as he says again, “ I have no pleasure in the death of *him that dieth*”—him that actually dieth. The poor man dies—but God has no pleasure in it, and the wail of his word floats over the gulf—“ Oh, that thou hadst hearkened !”

No. 18. “ Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.” A very plain scripture truth, that God made such a world as it pleased him to make ; but nothing of man’s future destiny.

No. 19. “ The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand,” Is. 53 : 10. Doubtless it shall ; but shall all men be saved ? That is the question.

No. 20. “ So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth ; it shall not return unto me void ; but it

shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it," Is. 55 : 11. The whole passage reads thus : "As the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be." Does it say, the thing which God pleases, is that all men be saved, however they may neglect the blessing thus poured out from heaven? Not so. *As the rain, so shall my word be.* Human neglect may frustrate both blessings. The rain of heaven may cause the field of the slothful to bring forth but thorns, and briers, and noxious weeds, "nigh unto cursing" (Heb. 6 : 8). So the word of God, appointed for a "savor of life unto life," becomes a "savor of death unto death." No text could better teach the indispensable necessity of human exertion, concurring with the divine favor. The same text, repeated, forms argument No. 53.

Number 21 contains this passage : "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him." Eph. 1 : 9, 10. Now, the Universalist might draw support from the latter part of this passage, provided he might reconstruct the two chief phrases on which the whole meaning turns, so that instead of "gather together in one" it should read, *make blessed in heaven*, and instead of "all things," *all men*. Without that privilege it can yield him no help. For if the



phrase, "all things both which are in heaven and which are on earth," be taken literally and without restriction, it designates the whole creation, animate and inanimate. In that case—observing the special and double emphasis which the verse lays on Christ—the most that could be signified by "gathering in one [i. e. under one head] all things in Christ," would be the exaltation of Christ to dominion over the collective universe, things animate and inanimate, friends and foes. The passage would then correspond with the statement of verse 20th in the same chapter—"hath set him [Christ] at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; *and hath put all things under his feet.*"

But there is a closer union than that in which the whole universe participates: the perfect union of Christ's friends, which he contemplated when he said, "I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me . . . . Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that *THEY all* may be one." Now, if we restrict this phrase "all things," in the text, we may not do it arbitrarily, but in accordance with other Scripture and the context. He will then "gather together all things" that are to be gathered, "all things in Christ," holy beings; "both which are in heaven and which are on earth."—One dark world, the world of hell, has no part in that union. But Christ will gather in one happy and harmonious whole, one triumphant church, of which he is the head, the

saints in heaven and saints on earth, Gentile and Jew alike. Thus, in the 22d verse, God "hath put all things under his feet, and given him to be head over all things *to the church*, which is his body."

Whether taken, therefore, in an unrestricted or a restricted sense, whether declaring the gathering of the whole Universe under Christ, as King, or of the whole Church under him, as Head, the text has nothing for Universalism. As Monarch, he will reign over a harmonious empire, and "break in pieces his enemies with a rod of iron;" as Head over all things to the Church, he will gather them into a perfect union, even according to his prayer while on earth. Which of these views is prominent, it is not easy perhaps to say. In the 21st and 22d verses of the chapter both views seem to be combined.

Number 22 cites four verses, (Is. 14:24, 27; 46:11; Eph. 1:11) declaring only the certainty of God's purposes in general, and therefore requiring no comment.

Number 23 cites the promise to Abraham, (Gen. 12:3) closing thus: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed;" and (Gen. 22:18) "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."

Number 24 is the repetition of the same promise to Isaac, Gen. 26:34.

Number 25, the repetition of it to Jacob, Gen. 28:14.

Number 26, the quotation of it by Peter, Acts 3:25, 26.

Number 27, the quotation of it by Paul, Gal. 3:8.

Number 87 is also, virtually, a repetition of the

same promise ; making the sixth use of the same material for a separate “ argument.”

The passage itself very obviously declares the extension of the gospel blessings to all nations on the earth, both Jew and Gentile ; but utters not an intimation concerning the final salvation of every child of Adam, in Heaven. To go no further for evidence, the apostles Peter and Paul, in the very passages quoted, (Acts 3 : 26 and Gal. 3 : 8) clearly teach that the fulfilment of that promise was taking place when Christ’s gospel was preached “ to the Jews first,” and when the same offer of justification “ through faith ” was proclaimed to the “ heathen.” “ They which are of the faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then, *they which be of faith* are blessed with faithful Abraham. And *if ye* are Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and *heirs according to the promise.*” (Gal. 3 : 7, 8, 9, 29.) This is sufficiently distinct. While the blessings of Abraham, the blessings of Christ, are to be proffered to all nations, these blessings shall be *actually reaped* only by those *individuals* who are Christ’s, who are of the faith ; *they* are “ heirs according to the promise.” There is no Universalism here.

Number 28 contains this solitary scripture : “ Is the law, then, against the promises of God ?” Gal. 3 : 21. But as this has no more connection with the question than has the first verse of Genesis, I pass it.

Number 29 contains a favorite passage. Is. 45 : 23, 24. “ I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out

of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength." Here the Universalist quotation always discreetly stops; but let us read straight on, and the passage explains itself: "Even to him shall men come; and *all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed*. In the Lord shall the *seed of Israel be justified*, and shall glory."

This, then, declares the final and open acknowledgment of God's ascendancy and dominion—his undisputed sway over friends and foes. All "that are incensed against him," shall be "ashamed and confounded," (as it is expressed just below); "the seed of Israel" (the spiritual seed) "shall glory." Paul has told us when that grand and solemn time shall be. He quotes this very passage (Rom. 14: 10, 11, 12,) as a declaration of the day of final judgment. He says, "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me and every tongue shall confess to God. So THEN," he adds, "every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Yes, friend and foe, we shall all stand before that judgment-seat, and, willing or unwilling, every knee shall be made to bow, and every tongue, even those that denied him on earth, constrained before that awful throne to confess that Jesus Christ is Lord. Even on earth, the devils were forced to confess that Jesus was the Holy One of God. Multitudes of men now defy his claims. But in that day, none will be able to deny the authority, or stand before that mighty power.

Number 30. "What he had promised he was able to perform." Rom. 4: 21. This text, in its connexion, declares God's ability to give to Abraham a son, Isaac, as he had promised. Another passage, once quoted already,—“none can stay his hand or say unto him what doest thou?”—also declares God's mighty power, and says equally little of final salvation.

Number 31. "Who gave himself a ransom for all." "That he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 Tim. 2: 6; Heb. 2: 9; 1 John 2: 2. Waiving the inconsistency, again, of Mr. Whittimore's quoting Christ's work to prove final salvation,\*—these passages simply declare the freeness and sufficiency of that work; it is ample, all-sufficient. All men *might* be saved by it; but will they? Of this there is not an intimation.

So we say, in this city there are free schools for the thorough education of *all* the children—they are provided for *every* child—not for our children only, but for the *whole* multitude of children, native and foreign. But are they all in the schools?—will every one of them be educated? Alas, not half of them, perhaps, are kept in those schools, not one in four will receive their full benefit. Christ died for the whole world, that "whosoever believeth on him might have eternal life." But he said to some, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." He gave himself a "ransom for all;" but his apostle tells of those who "deny

---

\* The reader is desired to bear this in mind without further allusion.

the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." The *offers* of mercy are made to all; the *promises* of mercy, only to those who accept the offers.

Number 32. "He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied," Is. 53: 11. Entirely wide of the point. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw all men unto me," John, 12: 32. This is very far from declaring that he will bring all men to heaven, and give them eternal life. Christ elsewhere defines, to whom this "lifting up" of himself shall bring eternal blessedness. Listen: "And as Moses was lifted up in the wilderness, even so shall the Son of Man be lifted up, that *whosoever believeth in him* should not perish, but have everlasting life," John, 3: 14, 15. The text, then, neither asserts nor implies the final salvation of all men. Its statement is in itself somewhat vague and indeterminate; and as its connexion is abrupt, its actual reference has been diversely understood. The previous words are these: "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out."

If we understand Christ to say that he is now breaking the hitherto undisputed sway of Satan, and attracting the human race toward himself; or that by his cross he will open a way whereby all men may come to him, and he will draw men of all classes and nations; either view would meet all the demands of this brief passage and the scripture mode of statement. The scripture, it is admitted on all hands, employs current forms of speech, without affecting useless and formal niceties of expression. Where general and even uni-



versal phraseology has gained a standing restriction by universal usage and perfect understanding, the sacred writers do not hesitate to employ it. All writers or speakers do so. Language just like this, is used of Christ in John, 3 : 26 ; “ behold, the same baptizeth and *all men come to him.*” It does not mean, (as is perfectly understood,) that every person in the world or in Judea came to him ; but that he was the object of general, or, as we often say, *universal*, interest. So, in the text, Christ declares himself the object of general or universal attraction, without at all impairing his other statements concerning those who will not receive him — who “ shall die in your sins ; and whither I go ye cannot come.” Similar general expressions are to be found in Nos. 38, 39, 40 ; which form a good commentary on this passage.

This I apprehend to be the meaning. Still, another view is possible. This word “ draw,” is used of force and compulsion, as well as gentle influences. (Acts 16 : 19 ; 21 : 20 ; Jas. 2 : 6 — the same Greek word in each case.) Now if we understand that he is to be exalted on the cross as the grand central object, toward which all men shall be drawn in endearing love or in eternal conflict — this, too, would give a consistent meaning. But in any case, the text does not assert that every human being shall be drawn *to heaven*.

Number 33. “ Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.” Luke 2 : 10. Joyful tidings indeed, freely proclaimed to all men ; but not a word of the acceptance by all men, nor their final salvation.

Numbers 34 and 35, contain the passages, John 4 : 42, and 1 John 4 : 14, in which Christ is called "the Savior of the world." But, as to be the "Surgeon of a Regiment," does not imply that every member of the regiment receives surgical treatment, and that against his will ; so Christ may be called the Savior, the provided, the offered Savior "of the world," though many obviously do not avail themselves of his kind offers, and refuse the provided help of the great Physician. Closely akin to this is the passage, (in argument No. 82,) "God who is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe," (1 Tim. 4 : 10,) — a passage that carries its own explanation on its face : the offered Savior of all men,—the special, actual Savior of them that believe. "God so loved the *world* that he gave his only begotten son, that *whosoever believeth* on him might not perish."

Number 36. "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you, whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," Acts 3 : 20, 21. The Universalist arbitrarily assumes that the "restitution of all things," denotes the final holiness and happiness of all men. But Christ uses a similar phrase of Elias : "Elias truly shall first come and restore all things."—Matt. 17 : 11. But Elias (or John the Baptist) was not to save all men in heaven ; he was to restore all things which God had assigned and the prophet declared—all within his function ; he was the means of a partial reformation among the Jews, "restoring" a portion of them only, and in some degree, to a right

notion of their own economy and of the Messiah, and to a preparation for Christ's coming.

A far higher restoration was to be accomplished by Christ, a glorious recovery of a fallen church (Acts 1 : 6) and a ruined world ; and " the times of restitution " here spoken of are no other—so the text specifies—than the same which " God spake by the mouth of all his holy prophets." The reader who will read the subsequent verses, containing the quotations from those prophets, will see that the text has no bearing whatever on the question of final salvation, but teaches that the heavens must receive the Lord Jesus, until *all things spoken by the prophets in relation to his work*, his reign, the spread of the gospel, the triumph of religion, shall be fulfilled. Indeed, in the next verse but one, we are told " that every soul which will not hear that prophet [whom the Lord your God will raise up] shall be destroyed from among the people."

Number 37. " I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed ; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." Gen. 3 : 15. No comment required.

Number 38. " All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord ; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him." Ps. 22 : 27. The spread and triumph of God's kingdom, *on the earth*, manifestly. It does not state that every child of Adam from the beginning has turned to the Lord, and is to be saved in heaven ; nor that it will be so.

Numbers 39 and 40. " All kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him . . . . men shall be blessed in him, all nations shall call him bless-

ed." Ps. 72:11, 17. "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name." Ps. 86:9. The same as before; the future triumph of Christ's gospel *on earth*.

Numbers 41, 42, 44, merely contain Scripture statements that God is a merciful God, good, and slow to anger. Ps. 136; Ps. 145:8, 9.

Number 43. "All thy works shall praise thee, and *thy saints shall bless thee*." Ps. 145:10. Among all these irrelevant passages let it be borne in mind that the simple question is, "Scripture evidence of the eventual holiness and happiness of all men." No comment is necessary.\*

Number 45. "The Lord is merciful and gracious; he will not always chide, neither will he keep his anger forever." Ps. 103:8, 9. Look forward two verses and you will find that it is mercy "towards them that fear him."

Number 46. "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." Is. 1:18. A gracious promise of forgiveness, uttered on the condition just expressed, "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings," etc. (verses 16, 17); and followed by the threat, (v. 20) "But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured by the sword."

Number 47. Is. 2:2. "All nations shall flow unto it," i. e. the mountain of the Lord's house. The fu-

---

\* The reader will take notice here of a characteristic procedure, in separating these three verses (8, 9 and 10) of the 145th Psalm, to make three separate arguments—but all irrelevant. The process is repeated in other cases.

ture glorious ascendancy of Christ's kingdom among the nations, in this world.

Numbers 48, 49, 50, 51, are made by cutting up three verses (6, 7, 8) of Is. 25, into four fragments, and arresting the quotation in the middle of the third verse, for very obvious reasons. The first two clauses are these: "And in this mountain shall the Lord of Hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people and the vail that is spread over all nations."—This, as the context shows, denotes the triumph of God's church in this world; taken literally, the deliverance and prosperity of Israel; or, if symbolically, the blessings of the gospel dispensation, and the removal of the vail of idolatry and superstition from the nations.

The other two clauses read thus: "He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces." There Mr. Whittemore stops; but read on:—"And the rebuke of *his people shall be taken away* from off all the earth; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." It is then *God's people* whose victory and fulness of joy are here predicted; and in the next verse but one we are told how he will tread down their enemies.

Number 52. "The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together." Is. 40:5. Yes, it shall be very fully revealed even here below;—and some shall "wail" when they see his final glory. Rev. 1:7.

Number 53 repeats the quotation of number 20, viz. Is. 55:10, 11.

Number 54. "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." Is. 49:6. Remarks are not called for.

Number 55. "I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." Is. 57:16. The previous verse tells us that God is speaking of the "humble and contrite ones;" while subsequent verses are laden with threats to "the wicked."

Number 56 contains the passage, Jer. 31:33, 34. "I will put my law in their inward parts," etc. But as the last words preceding expressly declare this to be a covenant or promise for *the house of Israel*, there is no need of comment.

Number 57. "The Lord will not cast off forever," etc. Lament. 3:31—33. But the prophet is speaking (vv. 25, 26) of those "that wait for him, the soul that seeketh him." Such he will not cast off forever, though he afflict for a time.

Number 58 quotes the passage, Dan. 7:14, in which it is said that "all peoples, nations and languages shall serve him"—declaring the final ascendancy of Christ's kingdom on earth, but employing a term, "*serve*," equally compatible with voluntary and involuntary subjection.

Number 59. "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plague; O grave, I will be thy destruction." Hosea 13:14. But *whom* will he thus ransom and redeem? The context answers, "Israel," *penitent* Israel. "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in



me is thy help," (v. 9); "O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God," etc. (14:1—5).

Number 60. "He retaineth not his anger forever, because he delighteth in mercy." Micah 7:18. Towards *whom*? The very last words preceding are, he "passeth by the transgression of the remnant of *his heritage*;" and the words following are equally restricted to his own peculiar people.

Number 61. The people "wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth." Luke 4:22. But those words had no reference to this subject. Yet on that very occasion he did tell them that Elijah blessed but one of many widows, and of many lepers Elisha healed but one. And they led him to the brow of the hill to cast him down headlong!

Number 62 refers, without quoting, to Matthew 6:25—44, where Jesus enjoins confidence in God, and dissuades from anxious thoughts for the morrow; assuring *those who seek first the kingdom of God* and his righteousness, that all things else shall be added unto them.

Number 63 refers to Matt. 16:6, 12, where Jesus cautioned his disciples to "beware of the leaven [or doctrine] of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees!"

The reader, as he casts his eye over these absurdly irrelevant quotations of the notorious champion of Universalism, will be sometimes ready to question whether Mr. Whittemore can be fairly represented—whether such puerile arguments could have obtained a circulation of 12000 copies in 1851; but if he will take the trouble to examine for himself, he will find that I am giving Mr. W. the full benefit of his "evi-

dence from the Scriptures"—all his quotations.

Number 64. "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels of God in heaven." Matt. 22:30. In the parallel passage in Luke 20:35, it reads thus: "*They that are counted worthy to obtain that world* and the resurrection [i. e. the blessed resurrection—see Phil. 5:11] from the dead, neither marry," etc.; a qualification which Mr. W. very carefully refrains from quoting.

Number 65. "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in." Matt. 23:13. Rather an unfortunate quotation for a Universalist, that the Scribes and Pharisees would not enter heaven, and prevented others! And not only so; but to these same men on another occasion Jesus said, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Matt. 23:33.

Number 66 refers (without transcribing) to Peter's vision, (Acts 10:10—15; 11:5—10) in which, by the symbol of a sheet containing things ceremonially unclean, with the command, "Slay and eat," Peter is taught that Gentiles, as well as Jews, are to be received into Christ's church on earth. This is the single lesson of the vision, as expressly declared in verses 34 and 35. The egregious and pitiful displays of weakness in Mr. Whittemore's interpretation, I omit.

Numbers 67, 68, 69, quote, by piecemeal, Romans 5:18, 19, 20, 21. "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto

justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover, the law entered that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord."

Now, observe, the whole chapter of which this is an extract, is occupied with a discussion of the method by which *believers* are justified. It begins thus: "Therefore *being justified by faith, we* have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ;" and continues in the same strain. He speaks of us "who have access by faith—in whose hearts the love of God is shed abroad by the Holy Ghost—justified by Christ's blood—reconciled to God—and joying in God;" (vv. 1-11) and describes the effect of that justification on those who thus partake of it. The argument in the passage quoted, contrasts the relation of Christ to the believer with that of Adam; and simply and manifestly declares that Christ as effectually secures the salvation of all who are united to him by faith, as the fall of Adam did the fall and condemnation of all that were connected with him by nature. We may add, that as nothing which Adam did, condemned the sinner to endless misery, independent of his own acts and voluntary participation in sin, so nothing that Christ has done, can save him from God's wrath, without his own personal, voluntary choice of holiness, and of Christ as his portion.

Number 70. "Because the creature itself shall be

delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." Rom. 8:28. Without entering on the discussion of a vexed and obscure passage, I would say that the most probable interpretation seems to be that of De Wette and others, which understands by "creature," here, the creation, or more exactly, "all nature animate and inanimate in contradistinction from man." This whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now—it is suffering in the fall; but it shall also participate in the glorious liberty of the sons of God—"with the coming of God's kingdom and the manifestation of the Messiah's glory shall be connected an exaltation and glorification of all nature."\* If this be not the meaning, the passage is too obscure to found an argument upon, and certainly gives no aid to Universalism.

Number 71. "Blindness in part is happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved," etc. Rom. 11:25, 26. This is a fragment of a passage concerning the ingathering of both Jews and Gentiles, *living in millennial times*. It has no reference to men of all times: Paul had previously proved that a large portion of the Jews of his own time would be rejected and lost. But the time is coming when "the fulness of the Gentiles," the great body of the Gentiles then living, and "all Israel," surviving Israel as a people, shall be gathered into Christ's kingdom, and saved. The church is looking and praying for that time. Meanwhile, "blindness in part is happened to Israel;" a *large* part of them

---

\* De Wette, *in loco*.

“behold as despisers, and wonder, and perish.” So do the Gentiles also.

Number 72. “For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord’s.” Rom. 14: 7, 8. Paul speaks of “*us*,” himself, and the fellow-Christians whom he was addressing. The attempt to extract Universalism from such a passage, shows the ludicrous straits to which the system is driven. Think of saying of a profane and loathsome wretch, “he lives unto the Lord!”

Number 73. “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” 1 Cor. 15: 22. A favorite passage; it is the one which Mr. Barnum ordered to be inscribed in the form of a pair of balances on the tomb-stone of one of his strolling circus-musicians,\* on one of those expeditions, in which he himself was alternately negro-song-singer and Universalist preacher, deceiver and dupe, swindler and swindled.

But the passage has no consolation for wicked men. Look through the chapter, and you will find the whole of it taken up with an argument for the resurrection of Christ’s disciples, drawn from the resurrection of Christ himself. And this text plainly speaks of the resurrection of the body, and nothing else;—it means precisely what it says, they “shall be *made alive*,” raised from the dead. Their state after the resurrection is not hinted at in this verse. Believers will indeed rise to blessedness; but the statement is not found in this text. The apostle, moreover, is speaking

---

\* Life of P. T. Barnum, p. 187.

here only of believers; he proceeds, "every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits, afterward *they that are Christ's*, at his coming." Here is a double limitation: he declares only the resurrection from the dead; he has in view now only the case of believers.

Numbers 74 and 75 quote other passages of the same chapter, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death," v. 26. Also verses 42—44, describing the state of the spiritual body in the resurrection. But it is difficult to see how the abolition of temporal death to the Christian, or the characteristics of the Christian's spiritual body, can prove the salvation of all men in heaven.

Number 76. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." 2 Cor. 5: 19. This verse states the object of Christ's work; but is so far from affirming that all men are actually reconciled, or that the reconciliation takes place without their agency, that in the very next verse Paul entreats them, "We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." Mr. Whittemore prudently omits this entreaty.

Number 77. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3: 28, 29. No comment is required except that, according to the last words preceding, those whom the apostle addressed had "put on Christ," and were "all children of God by faith in Christ Jesus."

Number 78 contains the passage, "Every knee



should bow," etc. Phil. 2: 9—11, virtually the same with No. 29, and sufficiently explained in that place;—not a holy and voluntary submission alone, but a subjection, voluntary or involuntary, before Christ's glorious power.

Number 79. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Rom. 10: 9. But how if we do not believe and confess? "He that believeth not shall be damned."

Number 80. "It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven." Col. 1: 19, 20. This passage, let the hearer observe, does not speak of all *souls*, but of "all *things*" in heaven and on earth. In interpreting it, we are therefore absolutely compelled to understand in a very limited sense either this phrase, "all things," or the word "reconcile." To affirm that literally all things in heaven and earth, comprising holy angels as well as beasts and stones, shall be saved in heaven, forces an absurd meaning on the passage. If we take this phrase in its unrestricted and utmost extent, the "reconciliation" can be no more than a general union, or order introduced into the universe. But if we choose to insist that the word "reconcile" here denotes a cordial union to God, then the phrase "all things" must be restricted—and restricted, too, according to the explanatory declarations elsewhere given in God's word;—he was manifested to reconcile all that was to be reconciled.

The real scope of the passage seems to be that *all reconciliation in God's universe* was to be effected only through Christ. The special emphasis of the verse itself, (“*by him, I say,*”) and its context, alike point to this meaning. The theme is the dignity of Christ. The previous verses are setting forth his glory: He is the creator (v. 16); he upholds all (v. 17); he is the head of the church (v. 18); in him is all the fullness of God (v. 19), and (v. 20,) he is the only pacificator, the source of all reconciliation in God's universe, in earth and heaven, between God and sinners, and among sinners themselves.

This “reconciliation” is so far from including the unconditional salvation of all men, which Universalism holds, that the very next verse conditions it upon continuance in the faith and hope of the gospel: “And you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet *now hath he reconciled*, in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprieveable in his sight; *if ye continue in the faith* grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel,” etc. Whatever, then, that reconciliation may be, it is here conditioned on continuance in the faith;—a condition fatal to Universalism.\*

Number 81 refers again to 1 Tim. 2: 1—6; a passage which has been already used piecemeal in numbers 7, 8 and 31.

Number 82 contains the passage, “God who is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe,”—but garbled and shorn of the latter clause, for obvi-

---

\* This exposition takes the text as it stands in the English version.

ous reasons. The passage has been explained under number 35.

Number 83. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and every worldly lust, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope," etc. Certainly a gospel that holds out a "blessed hope" to those who lead such a life as that, presents no great encouragement for the "unholy and profane," the "filthy" and "abominable."

Number 84 quotes Heb. 2: 14, where it is said that Christ came that he "might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil." But it is not easy to see how the crushing of Satan is to help his followers into heaven. Christ himself says that the wicked shall share Satan's sufferings: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

Number 85. "*We which have believed* do enter into rest." Heb. 4: 3. But what of the unbeliever? That is the question.

Number 86 quotes the words, "it is impossible for God to lie," Heb. 6: 18, and refers to the promise unto Abraham; which has already been discussed.

Number 87 uses the same material that was already used in number 56; by citing Paul's quotation (Heb. 8: 11,) of the covenant which God would make with the house of Israel, found in Jer. 31: 33, 34.

Number 88 quotes the statement made by Paul to his fellow-Christians, that God "chastens us for our profit," and that the chastisement afterward yieldeth

the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." Heb. 12: 10, 11. Christians have often found it true; while sinners have, like Pharaoh, been as often hardened beneath their chastisements. John tells (Rev. 16: 9) of men who "were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God;" and of others (v. 10, 11) who "gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and sores, and repented not of their deeds."

Number 89 quotes another passage which is in its very phraseology expressly limited to Christians, to those who "walk in the light." With his usual fairness, and according to the approved Universalist method, Mr. W. quotes only this clause, "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John 1: 7. The whole verse reads thus: "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." Comment is superfluous.

Number 90. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil;" i. e. his plans of wickedness and control over men's hearts. 1 John 3: 8. In Christ's followers this object is accomplished; and the argument of this verse is, that therefore he who lives in sin is no follower of Christ. Many do live in sin, and die in sin. The text says not a word of the purification, much less the salvation, of all souls; only insists that Christ's followers must be pure. While the next verse but one tells us of "the children of God," and "the children of the devil," with their distinctive marks.

Number 91. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." 1 John 5:11. Were it consistent for the Universalist to apply this or any other of these texts concerning Christ to future salvation, how ridiculous to bring forward this passage in proof that *all men* will enjoy that eternal life.

Number 92. "And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever." Rev. 5:13. However speciously this is used, no text is really more foreign to the purpose. It does not bear on the question; and even Universalist writers\* have rebuked each other for inconsistency in citing it. But they continue the practice down to the present time.†

The connexion is this: John saw in vision, the sealed book on the right hand of God, containing the future destiny of Christ's church on earth, and wept because none was able to open it. At length, the Lamb that was slain took the book: and as he was about to break the seals; all heaven and earth resound with joy. The Revelator first beholds the four beasts and four-and-twenty elders, break forth in songs; then all the angels take it up; and in bold figure, he represents all the universe as echoing the joy;—"Every

---

\* H. Ballou, 2nd, and Rey. Mr. Sawyer; quoted in *George on Univ.* p. 58.

† See *Univ. "Tracts,"* by A. C. Thomas and T. B. Thayer, 1856, p. 10.

*creature*”—not all men—all created things, rational and irrational, animate and inanimate, including those “under the earth and in the sea,” join the joy and praise. The thing which is proclaimed in Psalm 148th, (and other passages) where “dragons and all deeps, beasts and all cattle, creeping things and all fowl,” are called on to praise the Lord, is here represented as fulfilled; and they all seem vocal with the praise of God and the Lamb, in sympathy with heaven. Neither the connexion of the passage nor its particular expressions, permit it to be applied to the final salvation of all men in heaven.

Number 93 quotes Rev. 15 : 4, “for all nations shall come and worship before thee,”—one of the many declarations of the wide extent of Christ’s kingdom on earth in the latter days.

Numbers 94 and 95 quote, separately, two consecutive verses. “And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away.” Rev. 21 : 3, 4. But of whom is this predicated? Here, the author of the Plain Guide, and the author of the Book of Revelation, disagree; the former refers it to all men, the inspired writer predicates it only of the inhabitants of the “NEW JERUSALEM.”

Three verses further, the sacred writer affirms, “he that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be



his God and he shall be my son. But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone ; which is the second death."

Number 96 alludes again to the exhortation to pray for all men, specifying "kings and all that are in authority," and quotes also the passages, "if we ask anything according to his will he heareth us," 1 John 5:14; and, "the desire of the righteous shall be granted," Prov. 10:24. Such an argument for the final salvation of all men, does not even require a passing notice.

Number 97. "In whom believing ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory." [1 Peter 1:8. As the hearer would never guess the point of this quotation, I would inform him that the argument is this: the believer in Christ could not thus rejoice, if all men were not to be saved. And this is "evidence from the Scriptures" for the final salvation of all men!

Numbers 98 and 99 neither quote nor refer to any passages of Scripture.

Number 100. "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. 15:28. This passage is one of several that announce the final, undisputed sway of Christ and God over willing subjects and conquered foes. It does not declare a voluntary submission of all; the language of text and context clearly implies a different subjection of some. The previous expressions, "he shall have put down all rule, and all author-

ity, and all power; "he must reign till he hath *put all enemies under his feet*," clearly intimate that a portion of that subjection is a forced and not a voluntary one. The Mediator's kingdom shall extend till, as cheerful subjects or conquered, crushed and despairing foes, all things shall be subdued unto him—such is the Biblical representation—and then he will resign the delegated Mediatorial Kingdom, the one triune God shall reign supreme, and shall be seen to be Sovereign of the Universe.

Such, in its fullest extent, is the Scripture evidence adduced by the advocates of Universalism. It has been collected, matured and revised by one of the oldest living champions of the system; and comprises all the "Scripture evidence" brought forward by its advocates. How preposterous the attempt! How pitiful the parade! How contemptible the sophistry! Scarcely any of these passages, you perceive, have even the semblance of an allusion to the final salvation of all men. Nothing could be further from the point. They declare certain attributes of God; the greatness of Christ's work, or the freeness of his offers; the ultimate spread and triumph of the gospel on earth—millennial times; the blessings and the prospects of believers; or the final and open subjugation of friend and foe beneath his sway;—but utter no word of final salvation to the wicked. And then what serpent windings in quotation: now lopping off a sentence in the middle, lest it should say too much; now forcing together fragments from different portions of the Bible, to see if *three* can be twisted into a shape which *no one* of them will take; now rending apart four consec-

utive verses, to frame four separate arguments, and applying them to the whole human family, when in fact they were uttered of God's own people; continually tearing passages from all their surroundings, to pervert them, yea, even culling a phrase from the middle of a verse to apply it to God, when the text applies it to man; turning over the same promise six different times to make as many arguments—all false; quoting more than twenty passages concerning Christ's work, to prove final salvation, yet denying that Christ's work has anything to do with our state in a future world; quoting passages concerning "eternal life" and the "kingdom of heaven," for the same purpose, and yet elsewhere denying their reference to a future state; cutting apart a connected passage of ten verses, to refer the middle of it to the future world, and the beginning and the end to ancient Jerusalem; and greedily pouncing on every text that speaks of all men, all things, all nations, to wrench from it, however absurdly, this soul destroying doctrine:—how it reminds us of him who taught that fatal knowledge of good and evil to our common mother, in the garden, and who quoted Scripture to our Savior in the wilderness.

Do not imagine these things to be peculiar to Mr. Whittemore. I have tracked him closely, for the reasons already given, and that it might not be said these things were culled from the whole body of Universalist writers. Similar devices—many of the very same perversions, inconsistencies, garblings of texts and ridiculous expositions, can be cited from Hosea Ballou, Sylvanus Cobb, I. D. Williamson, A. B. Grosh, and the tracts published by A. C. Thomas and T. B. Thayer

during the present year. I think my hearers will admit that this method of reasoning is not unfairly exemplified in the argument of him who proved the duty of suicide, from Scripture, thus: "Then Judas went and hanged himself," Matt. 27:3, 5; "go, and do thou likewise," Luke 10:37.

The whole process is palpably built on two suppositions, which seem to be fundamental to the preaching of Universalism—first, that the hearers are singularly ignorant of the Bible in its connexions, and, second, that they will not intelligently compare these teachings with the Bible, nor even the preacher himself at one time, with the same preacher at another. It certainly seems to be characteristic of the system—no doubt with individual exceptions—recklessly to bring forward any passage, or statement, or argument, which, it is supposed, will tell for the time being—however unfounded, however inconsistent. Hence the ever-shifting phases of the system; hence the difficulty of knowing what it is at any one time. It is anything—it is everything—it is nothing,—as the case requires. It adapts itself to the mental and moral state of its willing dupes. One is quoting Scripture which another is affirming to be irrelevant. The same man at one time quotes what at another, for a special purpose, he discards. He freely uses arguments that are utterly incompatible with each other and with the system as elsewhere taught, yea, as taught by himself. He holds one thing to-day—perhaps to-morrow he denies it—and the next day reaffirms. The whole system is a dense, drifting fog, in which nothing is fixed but its fatal darkness, its deadly delusion.

You are astounded at the recklessness of these procedures, and ask how I can account for it. I, too, have been amazed at it. It seems to me here that the snare is spread in sight of the bird, and that never did cloven foot more visibly protrude, than in these deceitful handlings of the word of God.



## LECTURE FIFTH.

### THE UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT, AFFIRMATIVE. AP- PEAL TO GOD'S ATTRIBUTES, AND HUMAN PASSIONS.

Matt. XV: 13, 14. But he answered and said, Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.

I HAVE considered the Universalist argument, in its attempts to restrain the word of God from teaching future punishment, and to constrain it into teaching universal salvation;—and the failure of both attempts. I come now to consider those extra-scriptural and un-scriptural considerations, with which the system undertakes to override the refractory scriptures, and which constitute the main stress of its seductions,—the blind leading the blind.

III. The third portion of its claims consists of inferences from the character and attributes of God. In truth, as you have perceived, much of its so-called scripture reasoning, is merely the quotation of some passage about God's character, and an assertion built upon it.

So far as reasoning is concerned, this is the mainstay of the whole system:—"God is love, God is good, God is merciful; therefore he will not punish forever. God is our Father, and how shocking it would be, were a human father to be so unrelenting!"—Who



ever read, heard, or heard of a Universalist argument in which this did not form the crowning and exultant appeal, the grand pedestal on which all its shallow reasonings and deceitful handlings of God's word, rested for support? It is not what God says he will do; but what they know he will do and he will not do. Thus these men, who are every day surprised by the conduct of their fellow-men among whom they live, but of whom they cannot say certainly what they may do to-morrow, understand God almighty so thoroughly, and know all about him so well, that they can tell what he will do through all eternity. And not only so; but they know so much better than does God himself, that they cannot suffer him to speak for himself. And when he endeavors to speak of eternal and everlasting vengeance, Mr. Whittemore stops it off at once, by saying that where that word is applied in the scriptures to *punishment*, it "should be restricted to limited duration." The thing must not be mentioned;—it cannot be permitted.

This theme,—that of God's love and kindred topics,—is the theme that is spread out like a screen in front of all their arguments, and covers their straggling rear. Thus, Moore and Williamson devote whole chapters to this and kindred themes, before venturing to touch the Scripture argument. And the one insists that we should start with this foundation principle, and exclude from our credenda everything that stands opposed to it,—as, he says, does future punishment; and the other says he is prepared to reject any and every doctrine or practice that is opposed to it—as *he* also declares future punishment to be.

Now observe, in the first place, the presumption of such a bold position, even were there no word from heaven to guide us. What astounding audacity, that the creature of yesterday, baffled daily by the thin characters and plans of his fellow-worms, and stumbled at every step of his path over the mysteries of God's world, though they lie at his feet, should set himself up as the infallible interpreter of God's plans and doings through all coming eternity;—and not only so, but ask his fellows to risk their all on the infallibility of his knowledge of the great and unsearchable One. And think you, friend, when you have embarked your soul's hopes for eternity on Ballou and Whittemore's bold assurances—think you, are you quite sure, that God will stand bondsman to these men's promises through all eternity? The very neighbor by my side,—from my knowledge of his character, in a thousand supposable cases I cannot tell what definite thing he will do; much less a Napoleon or a Cromwell. How then can I speak for God? How his combined wisdom and justice and holiness and goodness,—all of them as far above me as the heavens above the earth—how these stupendous attributes will act in the greatest emergency of this complicated Universe, except as he informs me, I no more can tell, than I can grasp that Universe in my hand.

And still more presumptuous and insane, the attempt to take this position in the presence of God's word; and to control the very utterances of God's word. For this is precisely their position. "First principles should govern our investigations." "God is love. In view of this simple declaration, which

expresses a truth universally important, we should carefully exclude from our credenda," says the one. "Love," says the other, "is the the very essence, the life and soul of the gospel; and I am prepared to reject any and every doctrine and practice, as anti-Christian, that is opposed to this." "The word everlasting," echoes the third, "when applied to punishment, ought, above every other case, to bear the sense" of "limited duration." That is, God must never, in such a case, be permitted to mean as he says. Now, how preposterous to set up these inferences from God's attributes, against the overwhelming tide of denunciation contained in God's word. Is it not as though some piping gnat should set up his paltry whine, to drown God's voice as he thunders in the heavens,—as though some petty bulrush should lift up its head to stop the course of God's great cataract, as it mightily heaves itself over its rocky rampart, in ceaseless flow! It is insane. It is Hosea Ballou and Thomas Whittemore trying to muzzle God Almighty!

But the position that we are safe by reason of God's love, rises to absolute madness in the presence of God's providence. It flies in the face of his daily dealings. It is idle to declaim that God's love, conjoined with his wisdom and his power, must—yes *must* is the word—must finally exclude all sin and suffering from the Universe,—in presence of the appalling fact that God's love and power did not exclude it from his Universe at first. There would seem reasons of tenfold strength, why He should never have suffered sin and sorrow to come where all was peace; and, but for the fact, who would not have said it was, from the nature of God,

impossible? But He has suffered it; and has shown us how unsearchable are his ways,—how little we know him. We know of his plans only what he tells us. Sin and sorrow came into a universe at peace. They are here. And in view of that fact, all our arguings about their departure, are ground into dust, and blown to the winds. Six thousand years has God looked calmly down, while the wail of guilt and woe from hundreds of millions of human beings, has been continually ascending before his presence;—and who can tell us when it shall have an end?

It is vain to tell us that God is our Father, and that because a human father would not do so and so, therefore God will not do it. The crash of the earthquake, the dirge of the pestilence, the moan of starvation, the groan of disease, the cry of desolation, break on our ear in discords of anguish, and give the lie to the assertion. The human frame has sometimes fainted at the mere sight, and the human spirit lost its balance in the prospect, of single instances of the suffering which God calmly beholds, yea, and sends from the heavens in myriad numbers, day and night, through all time. God is our Father; but these plain facts show that he is as different from a human father, as a holy God is from a sinful man. “Would a father on earth consign his children to poverty, shame, sickness, loss of reason, and death attended with the most afflicting circumstances? Would a father on earth choose to plunge his children in the ocean, and leave them to the mercy of the tempest? Would he set a child’s house on fire, while he was buried in soft slumber, and consume him in the flames?”\* Yet so .

---

\* Parker’s Lectures, p. 46.

does our merciful Father. I find I cannot sit in judgment on God's goodness and its modes of action. The ruin of *this* world is quite as inexplicable to me, as the ruin which shall follow if the offers of rescue are rejected. Indeed, these offers of rescue relieve my mind of all difficulty in regard to those who reject them. When God has mercifully interfered, and in melting tones entreated the sinner to accept deliverance,—solemnly warning him on the word of his God, of the consequences of refusal,—I cannot but feel that here, at least, every difficulty is cleared up. Goodness is satisfied. It is enough. If the sinner will spurn the offer, impartial goodness as well as justice may even require, for aught I can say, that God should protect his children by the penalty and the impassable barrier. It is not impartial goodness, to waste all our kind efforts on those that spurn them, and leave the grateful and obedient exposed, —to foster the wolf at the flock's expense. Not only justice, but even goodness *to a whole universe* that looks to God for safety, may require the great Shepherd at last to smite the wolf with a remediless wound, for the safety of the flock. And when he proclaims it to be so, there is nothing in the exhibition of his goodness here to invalidate the statement; while, in the dreadful shades of sin and misery with which God has suffered this world for six thousand years to be draped, I read flat contradiction of every assertion that is founded on the goodness of God, against the sin and misery of the world to come.

Is it said, God cannot suffer such a waste of the human family? I answer, cast your eyes over the

world and see how the vast majority of the race are even now suffered to waste themselves as men; how few, how very few, attain the true moral or even intellectual standard of one made in God's image; and how many make wreck of all their humanity. Yet God suffers it to be so.

Am I told that sin is not a sufficient evil to entail such enormous consequences? I point you back to a single sin in an Eastern garden, long ago, that brought death into the world and all our woe,—that for six thousand years has scattered its bitter fruits, from that Asiatic garden through all lands of the earth, and down through all time.

Do you say the time of future punishment is out of all proportion to the duration of the sin? I answer, “the atrocity of a crime depends on the importance of the law, and the sacredness of the authority that is violated, and not at all on the length of time occupied in its perpetration.”\* A man may earn an imprisonment of fifty years in the same length of time as a dollar fine. Even in this world of imperfect retribution, is the punishment no more enduring than the sin?—or do men sometimes in an hour, commit iniquities from which through life they never recover? Has not the sin of a moment sometimes made a man a wanderer and an outcast all his days?

And remember too, that they who do not in this life repent of sin, sin on forever. Transgression goes on coeval with penalty. Sin begets sin. It forever renews itself, and swells its curse. The process rolls on. Sin and misery go, hand in hand, down the dark vale

---

\* *Ib.* p. 41.



of eternal horror. Thus even in the present life,—probationary though it be,—in our great cities, some unfortunate creature of guilt and shame, by one sad lapse begins to drain all the bitter dregs of a downward life. By a kind of necessity, which yet involves her own free choice, she throws herself further and further from the path of virtue and of peace; she becomes more deeply, desperately sinful and forlorn, and the way of return shuts more hopelessly on her view, as she goes sinking, still sinking in sin and misery, till she closes a scene of earthly woe and despair, known only to herself and God,—the very vestibule of infinite misery. Such is no doubt the natural course of all sin,—unless supernaturally arrested by the grace of God. Our God, in his great mercy, has interposed *in this world*, to suspend the doom and arrest the ruin. Suffering has no reformatory power, but in a world of grace and spiritual help. Here, God gives the needed help. Now is the time to escape the doom. We are passing the only spot in our endless journey,—this little life,—where the hand from Heaven reaches down to our aid. Reject that proffered hand throughout this life, and it reaches down no more; it leaves us to journey on evermore in sin and sorrow. So hath he told us plainly,—and God knows his own mind; he is not man that he should lie, nor the son of man that he should repent.

Does the objector now turn and say that God's punishment always attends on the offence, and the threatened transfer to distant times and places cannot be true? I answer again, look around you in this life, and see also how continually God is so dealing with

men here—delaying vengeance; how their sin often finds them out away from its early home. Think of such instances as his,—that man of learning, fair fame, and otherwise of moral life, whose one great crime lay hid for fourteen years, while he was enjoying the esteem of his fellow-men; then found him out and dragged him to the scaffold. Recall those cases, where the sins of a man's youth have haunted him to distant lands, and burst upon him in his old age, to bring him to his grave in ignominy.

Nor will it avail to maintain that as God is love, all his punishments must be remedial and reformatory,—and that above all, they never can be remediless and hopeless. The facts of Providence put their unanswerable negative on this assertion. Such is not God's love in this life,—except to his loving friends. It is not so. How many a crime, with its penalty, leaves a man worse off than before, his recovery far more difficult and unlikely. This is commonly the case with the greater crimes. Not only is the spirit hardened by the punishment, but the path of recovery is hedged up, and the criminal goes on sinking deeper at every step. Even under their castigations, evil men and seducers wax worse and worse, and their case grows more desperate. The man is, *by the very course of Providence*, branded and outlawed by his punishments, and sinks down, feeling that his case is hopeless,—that it is too late, too late; and sometimes no persuasion can remove the sullen despair. Benedict Arnold and Aaron Burr, and many a criminal and prostitute in our cities, have found no place for repentance. And many a course of vice has been visited with disease, from

which repentance could bring no remedy ; and happiness and life have worn away in suffering and despair. So far as this life is concerned, God often inflicts remediless woe. The truth is, God puts men on trial here ; and often the earlier are to the later portions of this present life, in a less degree, as he has threatened that the present life shall be to the world to come. He sets life and death before us, bidding us choose life. But if we will spurn his advice, he lets us reap the consequences ; and he will not interpose. He trifles not. And if the bed prove shorter, at last, "than that a man can stretch himself thereon, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself therewith," it is the bed which the man made for himself, against God's remonstrances. In it shall he lie ; and the Universe shall feel the justice of God. He brought his fate, forewarned, upon himself.—So the path to heaven and the road to hell are pointed out. God solemnly warns his creature that he is making his final choice ; urges him to heaven by all that is winning and all that is fearful : then suffers him to take and drink his chosen cup,—though he drain it to the dregs.

Against these solemn truths I not long since heard the following preposterous assertion : that "no matter if the man did rush upon his fate ; God was bound to prevent his misery, if he had the power. That if a man sees another drowning, he is bound to rescue him at all hazards, even though the other wish to drown. We condemn him if he do not. So God must do to the perishing sinner, or he is unworthy of our love." And a great appeal was made to our human sensibilities against a Being who could witness such terrible

sufferings and not relieve them. And I thought, where can this declaimer have lived all his lifetime, that he can so madly assert what every day's observation flatly contradicts? And in the midst of the bold statement that because human sensibilities are overwhelmed at the sight of great anguish, even so must be God's,—my thoughts wandered to those fearful facts furnished by the records of medical science, in which God has visited vice with lingering disease, that burnt like a fire in the bones, devoured the frame by inches, made the victim an object of horror to his friends, and for weeks or months was dragging him to the grave through such ceaseless, intolerable anguish, as I could not have seen inflicted on my worst enemy for an hour. And I thought also of a very different case—the sufferings of one who died a few years since in Salem, Mass.\* A visitor in 1845, described her thus: “The room was so dark that before my eyes were accommodated to the change, I could only see a figure dressed in white, sitting upon the bed and rocking to and fro. This motion was attended by a sound like the click of wooden machinery, which arose, as I afterwards discovered, from the bones as they worked in their loosened sockets. She had just given me her hand, when a spasm seized her, and it was twitched suddenly from my grasp. It flew some four or five times with the greatest violence against her; and, with a sound which I can only compare to that made by a child who has been sobbing a long time, in catching its breath, she threw up both her arms, and with a deep, guttural groan was flung back upon her pillow, with a force

---

\* Miss Sarah Parbeck.

inconceivable to one who had not witnessed it. The instant she touched the bed, she uttered that piercing shriek again, and sprang back to her former position, rocking to and fro, with those quick, heart-rending groans, which I had heard while standing at the door. It was several minutes before she could speak; and then there was none to answer. Both my companion and myself were choked with tears. I became faint, and trembled with sudden weakness; a cold perspiration stood on my face. The objects in the room began to swim around me, and I was obliged to take hold of the bedside for support.... She afterwards told me, as if in apology for her screams, that when she was hurled back upon her pillow, both shoulders were dislocated, and as they sprang back into their sockets, the pain was beyond endurance and extorted from her those shrieks. Her sentences were broken, uttered with much difficulty, and frequently interrupted by the terrible spasm I have described above. Yet this was her quiet state; this the time when she suffered *least*. Day after day, night after night, "*fourteen weary years*" then had "dragged themselves along, whilst her poor body had been thus racked." No relief, no hope of relief except that which death should give. And that relief, I think, was deferred for some years longer. Yet she was then and habitually in a heavenly state of mind; and I know not that this suffering was the fruit of any peculiar transgression of hers; but only part of the general woe that sin has brought into our world. Think upon that trying scene and ponder.

Listen to the incessant whimper and howl of Universalism, that God will relent because he is our

Father, and the punishments he threatens shock all the sensibilities of a human parent;—and then hold up beside it such appalling *facts*. What human father, if in his power to relieve, would have permitted that suffering a year—a week—a day—an hour—a minute? It broke down the stranger's heart in an instant. But year after year, God, our Father, looked quietly on and relieved it not. Listen to the audacious assertion that God is bound to relieve the suffering even of him who recklessly and willfully rushes on his doom;—and then gaze on this scene where even the loving child of God, by reason of her participation in the common guilt and curse of sin, though now herself a penitent, lay racked with such intolerable anguish, as caused the cold sweat to stand on the stranger's brow to see, and as shocks all your sensibilities to hear,—while for years and years, that seemed ages to her, God did not relieve her by cure nor even by death. No; nor would he suffer the friends around to stop those sufferings, though one grain of strychnine would have done the work forever. Now, it seems that God can and does lay even on the penitent sinner, a load of protracted anguish, that could weary out the sensibilities of a whole world of human parents. It is a portentous presage of the awful penalty which, notwithstanding the recoil of perverted sensibilities, he may inflict on the *impenitent* sinner, who, against all God's warnings and entreaties, shall have rushed on his fate;—and of the calm, unyielding, Godlike perseverance with which He that is not a man that he should lie, neither the son of man that he should repent, will fulfill every threat that he has uttered, however dis-



tressing to the contemplation. Such facts, a great multitude of them, of which the world is full, grind into atoms all this declamation about God, drawn from the case of human parents and human relentings. In the presence of such facts, as well as the threats of God's word, they stand rebuked as the ravings of lunacy, and almost the drivellings of idiocy.

So manifestly futile are these reasonings of Universalism, whether concerning the Scriptures or the character of God,—so transparent are their sophistries to the enlightened mind, that we find, at length,

IV. Its most effective appliance is its appeal to the sympathies, principles, and passions of impenitent men. Here is its stronghold. Here, the tribunal to which it brings its decisive appeal.

When all else is unavailing,—when Scripture proves intractable, and reasonings about God's mercy break down before the facts of God's providence,—Universalism has one resort that, with a considerable class of men, will seldom fail. It carries its case down to the desires of the sinful heart: it appeals to human depravity. In the fallen soul it finds a strong ally. Accordingly, we need not expect that this chosen belief of the sin-loving heart will die out wholly from the earth, till the heart's love of sin dies out.

“Is not the doctrine of eternal misery,” exclaims the Universalist preacher to his congregation, “a horrible and a frightful doctrine? Does it not make your blood run cold?” Doubtless it is both frightful and frightening to very many in his audience. Certainly it is alarming to those who are lovers of pleasure more than of God, to the Sabbath-breaker, the drunkard, the

profane, the adulterer, the rum-seller, the fraudulent dealer; yes, and to all whose hearts are bent on rejecting Christ, and living wholly for this world. It has personal terrors to them all. Therefore many of these persons on the Sabbath flock to hear some man who shall boldly deny that "frightful" truth, and give them comfort in their chosen schemes for the week to come. They come for their weekly anodyne, to quiet the sting of sin. But the doctrine had no personal terrors for Edwards or Payson or Brainerd or Judson,—however much they might deplore the folly of those who would rush upon their fate.

"My brethren," says Hosea Ballou,\* "there is peace in believing and joy in the Holy Ghost. But is there any peace or joy in believing in this doctrine of never-ending misery? There surely is not." And very possibly one general "Amen" in the hearts of his hearers, may have echoed the experience of the speaker. Doubtless the doctrine disturbed their quiet. And the case, as he puts it, well illustrates the difference between the peace of the believer and that of the modern Universalist. The true believer has a peace in *believing*,—believing in Christ—a joy in the *Holy Ghost*;—the Universalist finds a peace which depends on *disbelieving the doctrine of endless misery*. The case is well put. An Edwards, notwithstanding his views of God's holiness and awful justice, could enjoy a heavenly peace, contemplations of God and his glory, which, he tells us, were "sweet beyond all expression;"

---

\* Lect. Serm., p. 102. The reader will observe the characteristic sophism in the double meaning of the word "believing."

he could live in a state of joy unspeakable: yet, to Ballou and Whittemore and Thayer and Thomas and Williamson, there can be no "peace nor joy," unless future punishment can be cast aside.\* And to this rooted desire of every godless soul,—to this overwhelming interest and sympathy of sin, do these writers and preachers continually present their case with triumphant air. "Would you do so? Would you desire it be so? Is it pleasant to you to contemplate?"—are questions which they put with as much gravity to their audience, as though every soul in that miscellaneous group were a bosom-friend of Jesus Christ, a sharer in all the sympathies and a chief-counsellor of the holy God.

"If you had the requisite power," inquires Rev. A. C. Thomas, "would you not deliver the whole family of man from sin and misery? If you were the final judge of all, would *you* doom a single soul to endless woe?" And again: "Can *you* join heartily the angelic host in singing, 'Glory to God in the highest!' without believing in the salvation of the whole family of man?" Again he says: "Can you heartily adore the Being who, you believe, will doom some of mankind to never-ending woe? You cannot. I know you cannot."† Doubtless this writer understands the class of characters to which his appeal is made, and can safely vouch for them. There are many men of whom he can safely say they cannot, he *knows* they

---

\* See Whittemore's Plain Guide, p. 51, argument 85; Thomas & Thayer's Tracts for the People, 1856, pp. 4, 16, 20, etc.; End. Pun. Exp., p. 31.

† Tracts etc., pp. 3, 4, 14.

cannot, adore a God of holiness and justice,—a God threatening future punishment to the wicked. Such men can very easily be found. They can be found in a great many places where the name of God is often heard—but not in tones of “adoration.” But such men’s feelings are no very reliable criterion of the feelings and character of God. They now believe, or try to believe, that God will save all men alike; yet the place where they are accustomed to “adore” him is not known.

It is a very frail reliance, to rest one’s hope on the supposition that God’s views of sin and holiness are much the same with the average views of those who listen eagerly to the preaching of Universalism. There have been men, and that, too, a great host of the best and most devotional men that the world has seen, who could both believe this doctrine and adore the God who declares it,—who have gone loving, and rejoicing, and obeying, and adoring through the world, and have left a track of heavenly light behind them,—who have manifestly communed with God below, and beyond all question gone to “join the angelic host” and commune with Him on high. Not to such men could this preacher say, “I know you cannot heartily adore the Being, who, you believe, will doom some of mankind to never-ending woe.” No; he speaks to, and he speaks for, a very different class of men—many of whom, he not only knows cannot heartily adore an avenging God, but knows equally well that they do not now heartily adore any God at all. It is to such a quarter the appeal is carried; and there God’s word is overruled.

Sometimes the hearer's very sinfulness and love of sin are appealed to, not obscurely, as a pressing reason for disbelieving endless punishment. Says Rev. T. B. Thayer, of Lowell: "Consider all the *weaknesses* and *imperfections* of poor human nature, and all the temptations with which it is tried from without and within; consider also the many painful struggles, the many periods of keen suffering endured in this life; and then add to all this, that the life which is to follow is to be one of unvarying and interminable suffering—and can you believe it just and merciful and right? Remember how little a thing is the sum of life, and how great a thing is eternity . . . How absolutely horrible and frightful is the thought, that the faults and follies of this moment of existence are to be visited with indescribable woe and torment, sweeping over us in a ceaseless tide of utter and hopeless desolation, on and forever on in the never-ending roll of ages! and this permitted, inflicted by God, a just God, and a Father! Once more, CAN you believe it?"\* There you have the appeal almost in its nakedness; sin is melted down to "weakness, imperfections, faults and follies," excused by its "temptations" and hardships here; its terrific doom set forth in words not one whit more "frightful" than those which God employs—and then what is the conclusion? Is it,—“flee from the wrath to come,”—escape the terror,—*abandon your sins* and be safe in Christ?—No, no; the cry is, “can you believe it?” Believe it not; care not for it; dismiss your fears; go on unconcerned. You are weak, and imperfect, and

---

\* Tracts for the people, p. 19.

tempted, and prone to faults and follies ;—discard the horrible and “frightful doctrine.”

In the same strain, Rev. A. C. Thomas, on the ground that idiots, not being accountable, cannot be in danger of punishment, directly appeals to his readers whether, if the choice were given them, they would not prefer idiocy for life, with its exemption from danger, to the possession of reason with “the mere possibility of an eternity of misery.” He answers his own question, “plainly thou wouldest choose idiocy.”\* And Williamson, as we have seen, declares,—“had it been left to my choice, I would not for worlds have accepted the gift of life, even with the possibility of its coming to such a horrid catastrophe.”† In other words, this argument—for argument it claims to be—is a pressing plea for the rejection of the doctrine, founded on men’s *intense love of sin*—a love so mad, that rather than repent and obey God, and thus *make sure* of eternal life, it would prefer idiocy or annihilation ! For observe, the choice proposed is not between idiocy or extinction, and the *necessity* of punishment,—but “the mere *possibility*” of it, with every opportunity to escape by turning unto God. The way is open. Christ has died to save the sinner. The Holy Spirit is ready to help him to heaven. God the Father calls, “Who-soever will, let him come.”—And yet here comes a pretended preacher of the gospel, and urges the sinner *by that very opposition* to God, so intense as to prefer idiocy or extinction to eternal life on condition of faith, repentance and obedience,—urges him, I say, by

---

\* Tracts, p. 16. † End. Pun., Ex. p. 31.



the very intensity of that opposition, to cast off all fear before God, and defy the plain warnings of God's word.

This is the mode in which sinful men are made to feel that while cleaving inflexibly, as they now do, to the love and practice of sin, tremendous interests compel them to spurn the doctrine of future retribution. Instead of pressing them to renounce their sins, the preacher presses them to renounce that doctrine. And by confession of many a converted Universalist, no argument has ever weighed so heavily on his mind, as the desperate determination and gloomy necessities of his own love of sin.

To these attachments, and interests, and principles of the sin-loving heart, the system is continually making its wily appeal. Not alone when it asks its "candid hearers" to judge whether the doctrines of God's word accord with the feelings of their own hearts and the maxims of human life; but in all its sneers at the over-righteousness of orthodoxy, its easy moralities, its complicity with questionable indulgences, its proposed abrogation of the separation between church and congregation,—in these and other modes, it aims to enlist the whole force of human depravity in its behalf. And when some bold blasphemer dies, and his comrades gather round to pay the last sad rites, awe-struck in their own sinful course, not seldom is the voice of the preacher heard, soothing the involuntary fears of the evil heart, at that solemn hour, with the assurance that the departed brother is "made alive in Christ;"—and encouraging his boon companions to go and inscribe on his tomb, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord."

But the most artful and one of the most wicked things, is when the very dead are summoned, so to speak, to help destroy the living, and a man's love for some ruined soul is made an argument for ruining his own soul. It has been often and plausibly said,—and the remark has sometimes made deep impression on minds in peculiar circumstances—“I could not be happy in heaven, if I knew my friends were in hell.” If I were to meet the remark as abruptly as it is made, I should say to one who utters it, “Very likely you could not; for if you love those sinful friends—even though they be father or mother or wife or children—better than you love a Holy God, you certainly could not, and you certainly will not, be happy in heaven. Your statement is the statement of an unregenerate man. You will not enter heaven, if Christ's words are true.” But in those who are truly his disciples, Christ has made provision for even this sad, sad case. For he has told us that except we love him better even than all these friends and relatives, we cannot be his disciples; and if we do so love him, will not the infinite resources of that Almighty Friend become surety for our consummate happiness, even though other friends should have chosen to abandon his society and ours forever? Even on earth, have there not been virtuous and chosen friends, who, happy in each other's love and in the path of duty, though renounced by all their earthly relatives, have led a life of serenity and joy? Much more shall the kindred of the Lord of Glory,—they towards whom he stretches forth his hand and saith, “Behold my mother and my brethren”—in the blessedness of his love, and in the vast circle of the lovely

and the loving gathered round him, rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, whoever else may have refused to come and join that blessed throng. If God were able himself to be happy, in his own fulness, through the ages before the first creature sprang into being, much more will he know how from that infinite fulness to fill up the heart of his loving child, in the midst of the whole family that is named of Christ, and in his own heavenly home.

We may even discern, in some degree, how it shall come to pass. Our whole condition will have immensely and inconceivably changed in the other world. God will have wrought, in the Christian, the spirit of unbounded confidence, of perfect and cheerful acquiescence in all the decisions of his justice, holiness and wisdom. The love of the saint for his God and Savior will have ripened into complete maturity, and God will be to him an infinite source of joy; his affections, "that veered between good and ill," that were won partly by worthy and partly by worthless qualities, will have learned to love only what is good, and to conform fully to the mind of God; the mixed qualities of lost men will have given way to unmixed sinfulness, casting off all the restraints of life and breaking forth in open rebellion; the christian heart will so fully see the glorious mercy of God, reviewing his gracious efforts to save sinners, and their own free and final rejection of his tender love,—that the whole aspect of things will have changed beyond expression or conception.

Look at the history of the heart, even in the present life. God has wisely so made us, that our sufferings, much as our friends may sympathize or, at times, suf-

fer with us, do not take away from them all the comfort of life, especially the happiness of duty. Our sufferings may be intense and protracted, and may draw on their kindest feelings; yet if our friends are not in fault, their life is not drained of all its joy. Far less, if those sufferings are our own unmitigated fault, incurred against warning, and entreaty, and every better influence. The christian father's heart may be often drawn out in painful anxiety for his wandering, reckless son; but if no christian influence had been wanting in the training, and when every effort of kindness has been exhausted on him, and he has trampled on it all,—much as that father's heart may lament, he can still press forward in the life of duty, rejoicing in God, and, on the whole, a happy man. The love of a long-suffering wife, may, in this world, be so thoroughly wearied out by abuse, and her sense of the utter, inexcusable wrongfulness and vileness of her husband's course become so clear and strong, that when the man whom she once dearly loved, rushes at last on his earthly doom, his fate shall inflict no further wounds on her heart.

Conceive now the sanctified heart to be finding its fill of bliss in God,—the affections to be forever purified of sinful alloy,—the soul to be rejoicing with unbounded trust in the wisdom and righteousness of God,—the judgment cleared up to behold the unwearied efforts of Christ, and the stern final rejection of them all;—conceive the mixed character of the sinner to have burst from its earthly restraints and thrown off all its relics of loveliness,—and every difficulty, or fear that the happiness of heaven will be embittered by sym-

thy with hell, vanishes away. God will take care of heaven.

Such is the nature of the appeal with which Universalism presses every earthly propensity and affection, and the love of sin itself, to discard the doctrine of an endless retribution. It is its most powerful appeal. And a mighty hold it often takes of the human heart, because the inner citadel of the human heart contains a traitor to the Holy God. But effective as it may be with the traitor in the heart, it is feebler than an infant's moan against the plain declarations of Him whose "word shall not pass away, though heaven and earth pass away."

Here I arrest my discussion of the Universalist argument. I have shown you a portion of the multifarious threats of God's word, asserting, in more varied shapes than you or I could invent, the endless suffering which God will inflict on the wicked; and the pitiful, inconsistent, and deceitful attempts of Universalism to evade them. I have set before you the still lamer and equally deceitful attempt to force a few texts of scripture into the service of the system. I have shown you how the chief argumentative dependence of the system—the inference from God's love and paternal kindness—is presumptuous in itself, recklessly audacious as against God's word, and utterly breaks down in the presence of God's daily Providence. And I have also pointed out to you its ultimate resort and surest reliance,—its appeal to human interest and passion, to unsanctified sympathies and desires. The thing is rotten in every timber and every brace. And he who

embarks his eternal destinies in such a vessel, and sinks forever at the trying confluence of time with eternity, must have heard the creaking of his miserable hulk all his voyage through.

But the gates of heaven are now wide open. God does indeed love his creatures with a benevolent and a rational love. Yea, God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him, might not perish but have eternal life. O labor not with such unavailing toil to rear the frail structure that shall perish as the spider's web at the giving up of the ghost. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, *and thou shalt be saved*. Commit your soul unto him in humble faith and love, and he will keep that which thou hast committed to his care; and though he come with his mighty angels in flaming fire taking vengeance on those that know not God and obey not the gospel, it shall not harm one hair of thy head. It was no "lying spirit," but the mouth of the Lord of Glory, that said in his last solemn message, "Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

Repentance of sin and faith in Christ are the only safety. Even the false teacher is sometimes forced to feel it.\* In the town of Chelsea, Vermont, the daughter of a Universalist lay on the sick-bed, sinking slowly toward the grave. She had been strictly educated in her father's faith, and never permitted to hear the preaching of evangelical religion. During those declining days and weeks, she pondered in her heart her

---

\* The following incident was told me by the Rev. J. M. Coburn, of this city.



relation to God and the eternal world. She called her father to the bed-side,—“Father, are you sure that I shall go to heaven?” “Oh, yes, I guess so,” somewhat lightly replied the father. “But do you *know* that I shall go to heaven?” “Yes, my dear, I think you will,” he still evasively replied, shrinking before the pointed question and the fearful responsibility.—“Father,” solemnly continued the dying girl, gazing earnestly in his face, “Father, I cannot trust my soul on guess-work; Oh! I must *know* that my soul is safe!” He could not pacify her; and at length he said, “Rev. Mr. H. is in town, and we will send for him.” Mr. H. came. The same agonizing questions were put and reiterated,—“Do you *know* that I am going to heaven?”—and similar evasive replies were made; for that man, preacher of the soul-destroying doctrine though he was, could not, and, in that trying hour and that solemn presence, dared not tell that struggling spirit he *knew* that heaven should be her portion. Perplexed, and unable to satisfy her troubled heart, at length he took the word of God, and, turning away from all the chosen themes and texts of his customary preaching, that Universalist minister sat and read to the dying girl those passages that point the sinner to the Lamb of God as his only hope, and promise eternal life unto all that believe on Jesus;—in short, he laid before her, in the words of God, the very basis and conditions of the evangelical hope, “the hope toward God through Jesus Christ.” He went his way. The good seed took root. It was a plant of our Heavenly Father’s planting. She that had never heard an evangelical sermon, pondered alone on those words of God. The spirit of God

wrought evangelical faith in her heart, and she rejoiced in the hope of the gospel. Again she sent for her father—"Father, it is no guess-work now; I KNOW that my Redeemer liveth, and my soul is safe in his hands." And with kind invitations to her father to come also unto Christ, with cheerful, peaceful repose on her Savior, she passed away, rejoicing in the full assurance of faith. It is the name and work of Jesus Christ that sustains the sinking spirit. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." But if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.

---

## LECTURE SIXTH.

### THE MORAL TENDENCIES OF UNIVERSALISM.

Ezekiel XIII : 22. Because with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad ; and strengthened the hands of the wicked that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life.

IN discussing the system called Universalism, I have endeavored to present only the most indispensable considerations, and to compress the subject into the shortest limits. Much of my material remains unused. In my statement of the system, I have employed incontestable evidence,—the printed statements of its ablest doctrinal writers, of the most modern date. Some other features of the system, quite as bad, or worse, I have refrained, thus far, from presenting. I have pointed out the nature and character of the system ; some of the more obvious marks of its falsehood ; and, in detail, the futility of its argument,—both of its attempts to break down the Scripture threats, and to find Scripture authority for itself, or even to make a case out of the boasted appeal to God's love and paternal character ; and its final resort to impenitent desires and passions ;—an utter failure in every particular. I now wish to apply to it the criterion of this passage of Scripture, and speak of

### THE MORAL TENDENCIES OF UNIVERSALISM.

I shall show that its moral tendency is worthy of its

parentage and its advocacy;—while it saddens the heart of the righteous, it “strengthens the hands of the wicked that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life.”

Here, however, let me make a distinction between the system and the personal character of many of its advocates. Whatever may be the moral tendency of a doctrine itself, it does not follow that it will show itself in every one of its adherents. Thus, infidelity unquestionably tends to licentiousness and corruption, and wherever it has full scope, as once in France, it will break forth in all its power. But under the restraints of New England society and law, under the influence of early education, and the absolute necessities of his position as a religious teacher, I suppose Mr. Theodore Parker to be a man of good, if not irreproachable moral life. So, whatever are the tendencies of Universalism, and whatever the character of a great portion of its adherents, there is no reason to doubt, that in our larger places, especially, it numbers many honorable men and women,—persons who never have given themselves the trouble to look closely into a system that meets the desires of the unchanged heart. I presume that some of those, even, who have listened to my discussion, have been nearly as much surprised as my own congregation at the facts I have presented. As the Roman Catholic doctrine is a dangerous departure from the truth, and its priesthood we consider unquestionably corrupt, yet have no doubt that there have been and are many good Christians among the laymen; so here, there are laymen for whom one feels much more respect than it is easy to feel for the minis-

try as a body. Indeed, I know of one man, the leading Universalist in the town of N., in this State, whose notions are so high that he has repeatedly said he had never met a Universalist minister whom he was pleased with, or could respect; and though there is a Unitarian meeting in the place, he is a regular attendant at an evangelical church. So, I cannot doubt, there are in this city men and women, who, if they understood the bearings and hidden workings of the system, would run from it as from the pestilence; and who now are troubled with many a misgiving in view of the mixed group around them, and the strange exhibitions that they see. At the same time, a multitude of others love it, no doubt, for just what it is.

In attempting to discuss the present subject, I feel a difficulty. It is a system whose *full* workings none can fathom who has not been through it. There is so much that is deceptive about it, and so many of its worst effects lie beyond the range of respectable society, that the picture must be inadequate. Still, a good Providence has smiled on my attempts to get authentic information, till I have secured quite as much as I can use on the present occasion.

It should also be remembered that the system is of comparatively recent origin, and being held by a small minority, has been continually kept in check.

What are its moral tendencies?—From the nature of the case, what must they be? Surrounded with temptations, and filled with perverse inclinations, but restrained by the voice of conscience and the fear of God's threatened vengeance, what must be the effect on any man, of hearing every Sabbath as the central

and absorbing truth of the gospel, "live just as you please, and it shall all be well hereafter."

And here let me pause to notice a small sophistry worthy of the system. Universalism, it is said, makes known *immediate* punishment, and therefore must be far more effective than the proclamation of a distant penalty. I answer, it does not *make known* immediate punishment; all the present penalties of sin, men know without Universalism; it does not add one atom to their knowledge:—the thing that Universalism does, is audaciously to assert that this present punishment *is all there is*. That is its function and influence.

Again it is said, Universalism insists always on love; and love is the most potent agent of obedience. I ask, *what* love? Answer,—it harps on this string, "*God loves all men alike*, the sinner as well as the saint." Whether that kind of talk about love is fitted to produce obedience, let any man judge. As to any love in man for God,—Universalism is so far from practically *insisting* on it, that it tells him it makes not a shadow of difference with his prospects hereafter, whether in this life he exercise that love or not.

Such are the principal modes in which the system undertakes to break the force of the appalling facts which I am about to present. As arguments, they certainly are on a level with the rest of the system.

To facts now let us appeal; and see the moral tendency of the system, first as a code of doctrine; secondly, as a system of preaching and propagation; thirdly, as an influence in the community.

I. Its moral tendency as a code of doctrine.

1. Its movement has been downward from the begin-



ning. It began in this country with John Murray, who held to strict Calvinism ; except that he taught that all men were elected to eternal life. Before John Murray died, Hosea Ballou denied Christ's divinity and vicarious atonement. Murray refused to acknowledge him as a Christian, and Murray's society refused to hear him preach. But the movement went on, and, when Murray's generation passed away, the rejection of Christ's divinity became general. Ballou became editor of the principal Universalist Journal, and in the year 1818, after he had been twenty-seven years in the ministry, he openly denied all future punishment ;——the first man in the history of the world, so far as is known, holding to a future state at all, and denying all connexion of our conduct here with our condition there. The moral sense of the denomination revolted, and a sharp conflict arose. But so effectually did he use his organ that the moral sense gave way, and as early as 1829, according to Mr. Whittemore,\* there were few comparatively among preachers or people, who believed in any future punishment ; and in 1849, according to Ballou himself, none who dwelt upon it in their preaching. Meanwhile, the system has gradually dropped everything distinctive in the teachings of the Bible :—not only the great doctrines of grace, and all influence of Christ's work on the world to come ; but also the collateral teachings, such as the divine sanctity of the Sabbath, the influence of prayer, the existence of angels and of a personal Devil, the essential difference of human character, and in many instances, as will presently appear, the fact of miracles. With whatever

---

\* Mod. Hist. Un. pp. 439—41.

exceptions, such has been the doctrinal history of the system. I therefore proceed to show that, notwithstanding its outward professions,

2. The present position of the system is strongly infidel or close upon it. Let us take a look, for once, inside of the curtain. In the year 1847, on the third and fourth days of November, the Boston Association of Universalists held a meeting at Lynn, Mass. In order to cover over the real spirit of the denomination, and urged by certain exigencies, the following Resolution was introduced: "Resolved, That this Association express its solemn conviction, that in order for one to be regarded as a Christian Minister, with respect to faith, he must believe in the Bible account of the life, teachings, miracles, death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ."

That resolution could not be passed on the spot; but was suspended four weeks to another meeting held December 1st,—and then passed. But take notice—nine members of that association in good standing, one of whom, J. W. Hanson, is now editor of the "Gospel Banner" in Maine, felt themselves aggrieved by that resolution; and eight of them published a "statement of facts" in regard to it, letting us in a little behind the curtain, and showing what the Boston Association was in 1847. This testimony, observe, is not given by men outside, nor even men who had left, but by men then, and most of them now, inside the denomination and in good standing, yea prominent. To this resolution, nine ministers present were opposed, (one voting affirmatively to move reconsideration) and five more who were absent; while two, at least, of

those voting for it, had elsewhere distinctly denied the miracles of the New Testament, and some of the majority (so they said,) considered the resolution as a mere expression of opinion, not calculated to disfellowship any preacher. It is also a significant fact that the Rev. John Prince, (now of Essex Ms.,) in order to defeat the whole movement prepared the following amendment; "Resolved that this Association express its solemn conviction, that in order for one to be regarded as a Christian minister, with respect to faith, he must believe in the *entire* Bible account of the *birth*, life, teachings, miracles, death, resurrection, and *ascension* of the Lord Jesus Christ."

It will be perceived that this amendment, inserts three additional words, requiring belief in the *entire* Bible account of Christ, including his birth and ascension. Mr. Prince sought opportunity to introduce this amendment, which he is confident would not have passed; but the debate was purposely restricted and "muzzled," and after a discussion of only three hours, in which no one was to speak but once, or more than fifteen minutes, the vote on the original resolution was, in his language, "absolutely *grabbed*," lest the amendment, if introduced, should defeat the whole movement.

Mr. P. is confident that the original resolution would not have carried at the first meeting. E. H. Chapin strenuously opposed it; though himself believing in miracles, he denied the right to pass the test. Hosea Ballou (Sen.) was in favor of indefinite postponement *provided a record of the fact were omitted* from the published minutes. But when the adjournment had

taken place, and the eyes of the world were turned to the pending question, he threw his influence in favor of the Resolution,—and it was passed.

Nine, then, refused. But the majority carried it.—What was the position of the majority? Were they ready to exclude from the ministry men who did not believe the Bible account of Christ? Not at all. Says Rev. J. Prince, (one of the eight) “some who voted for it say that they regard it only as an *expression of opinion*, not as a measure virtually to exclude any one in particular from the fellowship of the order, or as an attempt to drive any one away from the Universalist ministry. Had they viewed it otherwise, they say they should not have voted for it.” What then was the object? Mr. Prince affirms his solemn conviction that it was but “a screen” before the denomination, and an effort to over-awe the freedom of the younger ministers. Rev. D. H. Plumb (another of the eight, now preaching at Warren, Ms.) says, “I stand now (Feb. 1848) just where I stood six years ago, when I obtained letters of fellowship and was ordained. *No questions were asked me* then in regard to belief. I believed in Universal Salvation then, and I do now. This was regarded as the only real essential of a Universalist. The manner in which he was induced to believe it,—how it would be brought about,—what would intervene between the present and its final accomplishment, were all regarded as questions of secondary importance, and were never to my knowledge put.” In conformity with this statement, we actually find Hosea Ballou saying, “we deem it proper to consider all who embrace this one item of faith” (the final holiness and happiness of all men)

“as Universalists, however they may differ” in other respects.\* Mr. W. M. Fernald (another of the eight) reports Hosea Ballou, Senior, as saying to him, “that ‘we could not, with our reason, believe in miracles as above the workings of nature; *that it was best not to say much about it*; that if any were so imprudent as to broach it now, they would have to bear all the brunt of the battle, and those who come after would reap all the good.’ On relating the impression I received from this conversation to a talented clergyman, he remarked that he agreed with the venerable gentleman . . . this was a proof of his wisdom; that he probably had not seen the time when the world could bear these views, and so had not proclaimed them.” In conformity with this “wisdom” of his, we find the same Hosea Ballou, a year or two later than this, publicly advising young candidates for the ministry to ask themselves whether they believe the Bible account concerning Christ and his works and resurrection.

But Mr. Fernald adds: “One of the most popular clergymen in the denomination, not sixty miles from Boston, assured me in his study last Spring, that he did not believe that Christ was even raised bodily from the dead.” Mr. Fernald contemplated preaching to a very popular society, and was about to send them word by the pastor of the church, as follows: “‘Please tell the people that I am a rationalist; that I do not believe in the miracles as above nature,—many of them I do not believe in at all—not even the bodily resurrection of Christ.’ ‘Fernald,’ said he, ‘don’t send

---

\* Voice to Un. p. 25.

any such word. Go tell them you are a Christian, and there are not ten men in the society that will care what you believe.' Such was the advice and remarks of this highly esteemed clergyman." Mr. Fernald asserts that those entertaining these views are not the obscure and uninfluential alone, but "they are among the first in the order,—the most talented, influential and popular."

And in regard to the Resolution adopted by the Association, not only are we informed that some ministers voted for it who privately denied the miracles, but Mr. Prince says of the lay delegates who voted for this test, viz., assent to the "Bible account" of Christ—I know that some of them voted for it *as they interpret it*—construing the "*Bible* account" to mean "*true* account," and therefore leaving the question what is the truth of the case, undecided. He also calls attention to the guarded phraseology of the General Universalist Convention, in their Profession of Belief, which only avows that the Scriptures "*contain* a revelation" (not that they *are* a revelation)—a phrase under which, as he well remarks, "Universalists of every different shade of belief respecting other points of doctrine than universal redemption, could most cordially unite." And he refers, in proof, to the Rev. L. C. Browne, who warmly commends that Profession of belief, yet openly rejects the Scripture narrative of Christ's miraculous birth.

Rev. J. W. Hanson, now editor of the "Gospel Banner, (another of the eight,) bears testimony thus: "That the principle, which, when logically carried out, results in Rationalism, is very general in the body,



is veritably true. There is not a single Universalist preacher who believes that Christ ever cast out devils or demons from a human being. They believe that those who were operated upon by the Savior, were insane or epileptic, and yet the Bible says nothing of the sort. The *Universalist Commentary* may say that Christ cured men of *epileptic fits*; the BIBLE says he cast out *devils*.”\*

Here is a moral picture for you:—Young men admitted to the Christian ministry without a question whether they receive the Bible teachings concerning Christ and his works and resurrection (or, indeed, a question on any point of faith whatever, except the final salvation of all men); eight members of the leading Association openly rejecting even such a test; the majority who carried the Resolution, giving up the remainder of the Bible—and passing the Resolution expressly with no design of excluding the deniers from the ministry; the most venerable member of the denomination privately discarding the miracles, but *concealing his opinion for prudence’ sake*; the talented and influential denying the resurrection of Christ, and affirming that not ten men in the congregation will care what a rank infidel believes, if he only calls himself a Christian; and the mass of the ministry tinged

---

\* Mr. Hanson also gives the following reply of “Father Ballou,” as resting on unquestionable authority: At the close of one of his public ministrations, many years ago, being asked by the son of his host, “‘what do you make of the account of the devils which were driven into a herd of swine?’ ‘Ah!’ said the old gentleman, ‘I was always sorry they put that story in.’”

with such accommodating and evasive views even of the gospel narration.\*

Numerous confirmatory statements could be given. The noted O. A. Brownson, who at one time was a Universalist preacher and editor, afterwards stated that it was very common for the clergymen with whom he was then acquainted, to speak of Universalism as a "stepping-stone," as the best weapon to destroy the orthodox, do away the clergy, and to prepare the way for something better. Of the 2,500 subscribers to the Universalist paper he conducted, it was presumed that more than half were skeptics or skeptical. And he had conversed with hundreds of professed Universalists who would own to him that they supported Universalism only "because it was the most *liberal* sentiment they could find, and because it was better than Deism to

---

\* The above statements are all of them from this very valuable document, the "Statement of Facts," dated, Boston, Feb. 5, 1848. Of the eight authors of the Statement, the Universalist Companion and Register, for 1856, gives the names of five as ministers, now in good standing in the denomination: Rev. C. Spear in Boston, Rev. D. H. Plumb at Warren, Ms., Rev. J. Prince at Essex, Ms., Rev. W. G. Cambridge in Boston, and Rev. J. W. Hanson at Augusta, Me., now editor of the Banner. The other three I do not distinctly trace, except as I learn from the Universalist Quarterly for June, 1856, that Mr. Fernald has abandoned Universalism by going entirely beyond it;—he holds that "the wicked will be eternally wicked *and happy*."

For my copy of this important "Statement," I am indebted to the kindness of Rev. N. D. George. I wrote to Rev. J. W. Hanson, of the Banner, for a copy, and received a very courteous reply, but not the document. I am happy to add that Mr. Hanson now endorses its statements. In his letter, now lying before me, under date of "Gardiner, May 23, 1856," he says of the "Statement of Facts," "Its contents were facts, but of no great value." Our opinions of their value differ.

put down the orthodox.”† Are there no other places where leading members of Universalist societies are infidel?

Abner Kneeland, once a Universalist, and afterwards an Atheist, stated that he reached the last position only by carrying out those principles of interpretation, which, when a Universalist, he brought to the Bible; and affirmed explicitly that Universalism is but a “stepping-stone” to infidelity.‡

Hon. Charles Hudson, once a Universalist preacher, afterwards a member of Congress, wrote thus: “As far as my observation has extended—and it has not been very limited, having visited scores of societies—it is my firm opinion that more than two-thirds of the males who are warmly attached to the doctrine of no retribution, are not believers in the essential facts of Divine Revelation.”\* A letter now before me, written by a preacher of the gospel in Rockingham county, recently a Universalist in Maine and well acquainted with the ministry of that denomination in Maine, states thus (under date of May 17, 1856): “They, the ministry, will not confess to strangers that they deny inspiration and miracles and regeneration and a special or general providence, yet such is the fact. One of the most spiritual in Maine is as much an infidel as Parker, and would have to stand with him if he confessed his belief, yet he is their most acknowledged spiritual-minded man.‡

---

† Review of Whitman’s Letters in the Monitor, quoted by M. H. Smith, p. 249. ‡ Smith’s Un. Ex. p. 243. \* Quoted in Smith’s Universalism Examined, p. 293, etc. For Mr. Smith’s own abundant testimony I shall simply refer to the volume itself. † Mss. letter of Rev. Jas. M. Palmer of Newmarket—by whom I am authorized to use the statement.

Listen also to a voice from New York : The same "Statement of facts," already quoted, gives a letter written from the State of New York, to Mr. Prince, (dated Nov. 10, 1845,) a part of which reads thus : "Brother Prince, When I became a Universalist, fifteen years ago, I embraced what is *now* called Parkerism. Since that time, I have not believed in the theology of the Jews, nor in their morality. I have not believed in the infallibility of the prophets. . . . I have not believed in an age of *miracles*, nor a *monopoly* of *inspiration*. . . . I have never concealed my views on these subjects ; but I have never said *very* much about them, except by incidentally incorporating them into my sermons. . . . When I became a Universalist, I supposed that these views were generally embraced by the denomination. True, I knew that one preacher at the West very strongly opposed them, and that he made himself very unpopular with his brethren by doing so. . . . Possibly, when the final vote is taken, there will be found more '*infidels*' among us than was even supposed."

Nay, distinct intimations of this position are to be found even in their published defences, as when Asher Moore, after admitting that all infidels believe the doctrine of eternal punishment to be in the Bible and for this reason reject it, significantly asks, "And when such is declared to be the doctrine of that book which proclaims good tidings of great joy that shall be to all people ; who can blame a man for pausing to inquire before he believes ?" And when Williamson asserts, "Now man does see some truths by his own reason and he knows them to be true ; hence he is authorized to

reject any and every doctrine that contradicts these first principles ;”—and four pages further, he informs us that “reason most sternly forbids the idea of endless woe” or “even the possibility of it” under the government of God. So also Thayer, when he makes this bold alternative: “One of two things is certain—if God is the Father of all men, endless misery is false : or *if endless misery is true*, God is not the father of all men, and *the Bible is false*.” And the General Convention of Universalists in the United States has purposely left the door open to “Universalists of *every shade of belief*,” (as Mr. Prince well expresses it,) by declaring as their Profession of Belief in regard to the Bible,—not that the Holy Scriptures *are* a Revelation *from* God himself—but that they “*contain* a revelation *of* the character of God, and of the duty, interest, and final destruction of mankind.” But who made that Revelation, whether God or man, and in what portions of the Scriptures it is “contained,” the General Convention of Universalists say not. They even make this confession easy to every capacity, by requiring only “an expressed *or implied* assent.”† The whole system, in its influence and bearing, is but an ill-disguised scheme of infidelity.

3. As a code of doctrine it is also deceitful and unmanly in its course. You have heard the pitiful perversions of Scripture, and the wretched disregard of all consistency in argument, with which the system is sustained by some of the leading writers. Those

---

† Moore's Univ. Belief, p. 52. Williamson's Endless Pun: Ex. pp. 24, 28. Tracts for the people, p. 51. Universalist Companion for 1857. “Constitution of Gen. Convention,” Art. 6, Section 5.

writers are not singular. My examinations have impressed me continually with a painful sense of their dishonesty and sophistry. Audacious misrepresentations and misstatements concerning facts are characteristic. And with this is joined a singular concealment and deception, concerning the inner features of the system. Bad as is the Universalism of the books, you do not get it all there. In this lowest deep there is a lower still. There is a Universalist system, it seems, out of sight. Here are men rejecting the inspiration of the Bible, the narrative of Christ's miracles, and of his resurrection, yet retaining their standing in the ministry; here are such men even as E. H. Chapin and T. S. King, publicly denying the "moral right to pass such a test;"\* here are other men voting a belief in these things necessary to a minister, yet averring that they mean not to reject those who disavow them. Here is the father of the denomination frankly confessing, in private, principles which he dared not avow in public,—and other men endorsing his wisdom; while popular and leading men of the denomination frankly own their disbelief of Christ's resurrection. So, Abner Kneeland was known by his ministerial associates to have renounced his faith in the Bible for years before he did it publicly, and he went on as one of them.† Says my correspondent, "they will not confess these things to strangers, yet such is the fact. They deny all miracles—inspiration—regeneration—the immortality of the Soul. They believe that when we die we become extinct, and then in the resurrection, be it sooner or later, the Soul is created *anew*. This latter

---

\* "Statement of Facts," pp. 1, 4. † Smith's Un. Ex. p. 248.



statement is true of Universalists, although our people do not know it generally.”\* Indeed so serpentine is the system, it is impossible to hold it to anything; and it is only when there is a strife within, or a departure of some one from the body that we can see its inner life. For example,—there is a certain preacher of the system, who in his last conversation with a Congregational minister, some years since, was a Restorationist. Not many months ago, in conversation with an intelligent Orthodox physician, being closely pressed, he was inclined to admit *some* future punishment; but, a few days later, he calls him aside to say that he did not know whether there would or would not be any future punishment; then in a conversation with a Baptist minister, not six months since, he denies in so many words that he is a Restorationist; afterwards, another Congregational minister hears him publicly endorse, in a story, the position that impenitent persons were in heaven at the time of the funeral sermon; members of his own congregation affirm that he does not believe in any future punishment; and then all of a sudden he affirms, *or seems to affirm*, that he does.† What sort of a system is that? A system with such a serpentine track is worthy of its origin.

II. I said, the moral tendencies of the system might be seen in its method of preaching and propagation.

---

\* Mr. Palmer makes this statement more particularly of those within his acquaintance, and at the time of his acquaintance four or five years ago. He has since spoken to me of the constant vacillation of the denomination, rendering it difficult to say what the same men hold for any length of time. † The testimony of all these persons is at hand. One of them is the writer of these lectures.

Let me not dwell on this point. Is not its style of preaching low and contentious? \* Does it spend its chief strength in trying to make men love God with all their hearts, and their neighbors as themselves? Does it labor and toil to make men virtuous and pure, as Christ also is pure? Does it seek to form the youth to lofty plans and aspirations, and to reclaim them from the tempter's power? Is its whole influence a blessing to young men, and a restraint on all forms of vice in the community? Or is it the chief burden of its preaching, to dispel all dread of sin, and all over-righteousness, and to ridicule and abuse other denominations? Is it perpetually seeking to get into a wrangle with those who do apply the restraint of Christ's gospel to the love of sin? And how long could its preachers hold out to preach, were there no Orthodoxy to fight with and to furnish themes? Is there an instance in New Hampshire, indeed, how many instances are there in the whole country, of a Universalist church with permanent preaching, except where one or more evangelical churches had been first established, or establishing, to which it might attach itself like a barnacle and swim, or fasten itself like a leach to draw blood? And were all the evangelical pulpits to be shut up, how long would it be before Universalism would preach its last sermon? And its weekly battle—is it against iniquity or against orthodoxy? Does it aim chiefly at making men love God, or hate Calvinism?—

---

\* A few such preachers as E. H. Chapin and others must be cheerfully excepted; the remarks apply to a large portion of the denomination, and probably to nearly all of the rural preachers. Would that exceptions were more numerous.

And which does it most effectually accomplish? Does it flourish by opposing sin,—or by winking at it? Does it depend for acceptance on the qualities that Paul requires in Timothy and Titus,—or on its jovial qualities, its good-fellowships, and odd-fellowships, its boon companionships and high times, and all that sort of influence? What annual denominational gatherings in this city are never made perfect without the dance, and sometimes witness whole heaps of them who were not slain with the sword? Let those who have seen it most and know it best, make answer.

III. But I pass, thirdly, to consider the moral tendencies of Universalism, as an influence on its hearers and the community.

There are many men of wealth, some of respectable standing and high general character, who for reasons of their own choose to support that system. Some of its supporters, indeed, see through it from end to end. But some were educated in that belief. Others, for the sake of their friends, wish to find it true. There are many others, some of them young and lively, who know little about the real character of the system, and have never reflected on its influence; but who have floated into the current around them, and are sporting in it as a kind of summer sea. Let such individuals consider themselves exempted, so far as they deserve, from my general remarks.

As a general moral and religious influence, Universalism has both a negative and a positive influence. There are some things it does not do, and some that it does.

1. There are some things it does not do. (1.) It

does not lead to the confession of Christ before men. Now the apostles formed churches, observed the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and made arrangements to maintain mutual Christian conference, and purity of life. So has evangelical religion invariably done. Not so does Universalism. The formation of a church is the exception and not the rule. Whittemore himself admits, after Ballou 2nd, that "*more than two-thirds*" of their congregations have no churches.\* The truth is, the thing is not attempted, I believe, except in the larger places, where respectability renders it necessary. And there, how meagre the number of those who are willing to go through even the form of confessing Christ—although both Whittemore and Ballou, Senior, propose to abolish all distinction between church and congregation,† and to have the whole congregation join in the ordinance, just as the whole community, says Ballou, "joins in celebrating our national independence." But the congregation doubtless feel, as was once said to Smith, that *that* would "be carrying the joke quite too far." And well they may, when the leader himself endorses the sentiment of Ballou 2nd, that he "has doubts of the existence of ordinances in Christianity."‡ And the very latest intelligence is, that the proposed obliteration of the line between church and congregation is begun. "In several of the Western States," says the Universalist Companion for 1857, "we are reorganizing. Societies and churches are organized under one Constitution, and are termed 'Churches.' This is

---

\* Plain Guide, p. 326. † Ib. p. 332. Voice to Un. p. 20. ‡ Plain Guide, p. 325.

as it *should* be," adds the editor.\* Happy times, indeed, for Universalism, when the distinctive badges of Christianity are laid aside!

(2.) It does not lead men to earnest prayerful study of God's word. At most, it leads men to cull out isolated passages from the Bible. It presumes that they do not habitually and devoutly search the Scriptures, or it would never venture on such reckless perversions as I have exposed in your presence. And where men have gone prayerfully and humbly to the Bible, willing to be taught, there are abundant instances in which they have abandoned Universalism.

(3.) It does not lead to habits of prayer. At the time when Matthew Hale Smith first published his book, he was able to testify that neither himself nor any minister of that denomination, whom he knew, had observed family prayer.† Adin Ballou, quoted in the same volume, also asserted that his former brethren regarded family prayers, blessings at meals, "as idle ceremonies."‡ After the publication of his book, some change was introduced, to stop the mouths of the orthodox. But I infer that it could not have been very extensive or lasting. My informant from Maine says thus: "Among Universalists, (and I am very well acquainted with the ministry,) I never knew a person who prayed, except the ministry, and they never except officially or when pressed to it in private."§ Why should they? Says the Rev. O. A. Skinner, "The change which our devotions are intended to make, is upon *ourselves*, not upon the Almighty."|| Prayer,

---

\* Un. Comp. for 1857, edited by Rev. A. B. Grosh, p. 48. † Univ. Ex. p. 227. ‡ Ib. p. 296. § J. M. Palmer. || Univ. Ill. and Def. p. 331; quoted from N. D. George.

as an asking of God, is made a meaningless form. And for a genuine prayer-meeting, such as is found in thousands of evangelical churches in the country, in the whole Universalist denomination where are there twenty—yea, regularly maintained for a series of years, may I not safely ask, *where is there one?* It does not naturally lead men to pray even on the death-bed. The Universalist may pray there, but it is of no account; he has no need of it,—there is nothing to be gained by it, on his system. A few years since, a stone-cutter of Manchester, a strong Universalist, who had parted from his wife because he could not keep both his wife and his bottle, went home to Bedford sick, and declining toward death. As he was about to pass away, his mother told him that his end was near, and asked him to say the Lord's prayer. "I won't," was the answer. The mother urged—but she gained no other reply than "I won't." And so he died. Now I say, that was consistent Universalism. He was at his last gasp; there was nothing to gain in this world, not even any further influence on himself: in the next world it would make no difference whether he prayed or not, or what he did: so he died consistent, and said, "I won't pray."

(4.) Universalism does not lead to Missionary efforts or reformatory labors. Christian denominations push forth among the heathen, and are dotting the world with their sparks of light. Universalism's missionary labors are confined to crusades against Christian churches. For a considerable time, the denomination was opposed to Sabbath-schools, and to the temperance movement; and though necessity compelled a change



on both those points, I suppose it is safe to say, that more opposers of temperance are found in the few Universalist societies of New England than in all the evangelical societies put together,—though the latter are scores of times more numerous.

(5.) Universalism does not reform the vicious. The evangelical churches can point to hundreds and thousands of vicious men reclaimed, by conversion, to a virtuous and holy life. They can point even to profligate men, formerly of the Universalist belief, made exemplary by conversion. Now there are moral men among Universalists, but where are the men who have been made so by their Universalism? Where is the man who can stand up and say, “I was a drunkard, a gambler, profane, licentious, a Sabbath-breaker, prayerless: but I became a Universalist, and instantly I lost all relish for these things.” Among the multitude of dissolute persons to whom Universalism has free access, where does it point to a single trophy of the kind? Where is there a dissolute young man in this city, that has been reformed by embracing Universalism, or restrained in vice by attending Universalist preaching? Show us the man.

Nay, friends, Universalism does none of these things, and every one of you knows it. But there are

2. Some things which it does.

(1.) It often marks the transition of a nominal Christian to a prayerless, ungodly life. Let an orthodox man turn Universalist, and, if he prayed before, it is quite certain he will soon cease; or let such a man become vicious, and the probabilities are that he will turn Universalist or open infidel. The second Univer-

salist society of Lynn is a case in point, where, at its formation, nearly all its leading members were Methodist backsliders, men who had lost their religion.

(2.) It enlists the warm support and sympathy of the vicious, *in their sins*. When such men follow their inclinations, unrestrained by considerations of relationship, business or respectability, if they go to any meeting, it will be to a Universalist one. When I was a boy, that was the mark by which I used to learn of the occasional coming of a Universalist preacher to the town. The way sparkled with all the ruby faces of the town. There were indeed some respectable men among them,—but Universalism, and Universalism alone, was sure to call out the drunkards, and profane. They went to hear; and returned—to their cups and their oaths. And that is the difference between the preaching of Christ, and of Universalism. We are sometimes told that the publicans and harlots went to hear Christ! Yes, but under his preaching, Christ said, “the publicans and harlots went into the kingdom of heaven;” but under Universalist preaching, the drunkards and profane go back to the kingdom of hell. And so notorious is this sympathy and support from men in their sins, that when Mr. Stevens, of Barnet, Vt., informed my friend of a great public controversy, in Danville, Vt., between a Universalist and an orthodox preacher, and added that the friends of the one party resorted to the hotel and held grand carousals there, his auditor had no occasion to ask whose friends they were.

(3.) Universalism actually produces in the bulk of its hearers an entire indifference to vital religion. On

this point hear their own men: Rev. J. George of the State of New York, (said by the editor of the Gospel Banner to be one of the best ministers,) in June, 1849, writes thus to that paper: Speaking of the claims of vital religion upon the heart, he says, "it is a shameful truth that this important demand of the gospel is almost entirely neglected in the denomination. Vital piety, a new heart, and a prayerful and holy life, as the first obligation in the New Testament, has but few advocates in the order."\* Is there a man living that dares deny his statement? Even Mr. Whittemore was constrained to confess, "The morals of the Universalist would, and must, in the very nature of things, be purer than the morals of those operated upon by different opinions, were it not that he makes his religion too much *a thing of theory and too little a thing of practice*. This is the fault of many Universalists."† It must be confessed, I think, a slight religious defect, when a denomination's purity of morals is a "thing of theory" and not "a thing of practice."

Accordingly it is remarkable that from those who have abandoned Universalism, there comes one unanimous testimony to its entire destitution of all religious life. Says Rev. J. M. Palmer of his former acquaintances, "Of course there are some noble-minded men; but I know of no one who seems to me a Christian, or who approximates thereto. I feel that they are set forth in the Bible generally, as 'men of corrupt minds, reprobates concerning the faith'—'in all whose thoughts God is not.'" Now, members of evangelical

---

\* Gospel Banner, June, 1849. Quoted from George's Univ. not of the Bible, p. 383. † Plain Guide, p. 283.

denominations, Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and others, are continually interchanging their ecclesiastical relations ; but whatever their preferences, they never fail to feel and testify to the christian integrity and deep-toned piety of the great bulk of the church they have left. On the other hand, they that abandon Universalism, never fail to testify that the system has no religious life. Their agreement is remarkable. Even the Universalist Quarterly Review admits the agreement ; for in speaking of Mr. Fernald, (who abandoned the denomination by outstripping them,) it commends him, as having, with few exceptions, little in common with *the vulgar herd of apostates*, who in times past sought to malign the party they had deserted.”\*

As I once sat listening to a Universalist discourse, and gazed around on the faces of those who were greedily devouring the promise of eternal life, I had a curious thought pass through my mind, and it was this : Suppose all these young men and women were actually this moment transferred to heaven, the heaven of God, where Christ and all the holy dwell in holy bliss forever—and suppose, by some unaccountable arrangement, the gates of heaven were left unclosed, and the way open down to the dancing halls, and oyster shops, and liquor saloons, and similar places here below—how many of these persons would be found in heaven at the end of fifteen minutes?—No, my hearers, Universalism does not cultivate a relish for holy pleasures, for the presence of God and Christ, and all the good.

---

\* Un. Quarterly for Jan. 1856, p. 104.

(4.) Universalism has led, and is constantly leading, multitudes of men into every species of iniquity. It takes off all efficient control. On this point I have a mass of evidence, the evidence of facts; and the only difficulty is to select.

What kind of evidence do you want, and from what quarter drawn? Shall it be from those who once preached the doctrine? Listen then to Lewis C. Todd, of Herkimer Co., N. Y., once a zealous editor and preacher of Universalism, afterwards a Methodist: "I candidly aver in the fear of God, that I do not believe the doctrine ever made a single soul any better than he otherwise would have been, while it has been the means of removing the necessary restraint and giving latitude to thousands whose propensities and passions needed restraint, whereby they have indulged in criminal pursuits, and gone to perdition." When this testimony was published in the *Millennial Harbinger*, the editor of that periodical added, "I am personally acquainted with some four or five Universalian preachers, who have joined the church of Christ of which I am a member, who all say that Mr. Todd speaks their experience, or who all concur with him in their opinion."\* Paul Dean of Boston, who left the denomination in 1828, Chas. Hudson, member of Congress in 1843, and Adin Ballou, have lifted up a similar testimony in regard to the moral tendency of the doctrine. Mr. Smith gives the names of more than twenty ministers, who have borne similar witness.†

Would you have the confession of a body of Uni-

---

\* Arvine's Cyclop., sec. 424.

† Univ. Exam. p. 293. Extracts are given in the volume.

versalist ministers themselves? In the month of July, 1835, so says the Trumpet of July 11th, the Universalist Convention of Maine, passed a resolve recommending to the societies of Maine, "that no man known to be addicted to the habit of drunkenness, or gambling, or profane swearing, or who is an unbeliever of Christianity, should be appointed to office in the societies."\* Would it not be high times, when the Maine Conference of Congregational ministers should need to pass such a vote?

Will you hear a warning from the prison? Listen then to the Rev. J. B. Finley, (Methodist,) chaplain of the Ohio Penitentiary from 1846 to 1850. Says he "I found some hardened infidels in these dungeon cells. They were steeped in crime; and their souls were as hard as the granite rock. They had been cursed and ruined by bad books, . . . and most of them had gone to infidelity through the convenient doorway of Universalism."§ Again, "I consider Universalism the worst form of infidelity. Nearly all the prisoners have been infected with it, while in their career of vice. Nothing else, they say, could have held them up in crime at the risk of life at every step they took, but the conviction which they tried hard to entertain, that after a life of stealing, house-breaking, robbing, plundering and murder, they would certainly go to sit down with the patriarchs in heaven! Oh, what a soul-damning error! It has ruined millions of the human family!" Again, (p. 122,) "To-day we had a great many visitors and among them a large number

---

\*Quoted by N. D. George, p. 384. † Memorials of Prison Life p. 31.



of Universalist ministers. The latter looked through the prison with great interest. I thought in my heart as they were going round, that their doctrines had sent many of these wretched men to this fearful place ; and this was a fact that I could prove by a score of confessions, perhaps twice or three times a score, given me by the convicts themselves. About thirty of these inmates are here for murder. How cruel, how wicked, how unjust, said I to myself, as these ministers were walking about, to commit these thirty men to this gloomy prison during life, for the meritorious act of sending an equal number of their suffering fellow-mortals from the cares of this world to the everlasting joys of heaven. Oh, folly ! what a doctrine of devils is this ! what a responsibility have these men assumed ! I was glad to find, that, as soon as their character became known, they were looked down upon by many of the degraded prisoners themselves.” Thus testifies Mr. Finley. And he furnishes a narrative given by one of the prisoners, who having tried Atheism, and afterwards Deism, in vain, was at length pacified in his career of crime by the preaching of a *Universalist* minister.\*

Would you hear a voice from the death bed of a converted profligate ? Listen to Nathan Dyer, (of Steuben, Washington Co., Me.,) who died on the 11th of April, 1835, sending his dying testimony to the congregation, that Universalism, the doctrine of his life, was a fatal and soul-ruining system. He had tried hard to discard the Bible wholly ; he could not resist the evidence that it came from God. “ He was led to

---

\* Id. pp. 113—117.

enquire whether he could not be a believer in Christianity, and yet deny all that he deemed offensive in its doctrines, and uncomfortable in its restraints." He fell in with Universalism: it fulfilled the condition. It promised him impunity in sin. Shrinking from all discussions, and from all Scripture that implied eternal punishment, he hugged Universalism to his heart, and plunged madly in a course of vice, from which he rested not till God's arrow pierced his vitals. Then, in that lingering disease, he was led by his own reflections to see his ruin, to embrace the cross, and lift up his word against the awful delusion that had buoyed him up in sin.\*

Would you have a warning from the death-bed of the hardened profligate? Listen to the words of the dying Universalist, Frost, of Sherburne, Mass. See him running down three years with consumption, yet frightfully profane and reckless to the very last; and saying that he wanted no funeral sermon, and cared not how they disposed of his body, — *he* should be well off.†

Would you hear the testimony of the dying mother of three profligate sons,—all of whom had separated from their wives without divorce, two of whom were living with other women, and one if not two of whom had been in jail for theft? Listen, then, to the sad wail of the dying Mrs. —, of Salisbury:—"When my husband became a Universalist, it was the ruin of my sons."‡

Would you desire the witness of intelligent observers

---

\* Rider's Lectures, p. 274, etc. † Furnished by Rev. T. P. Sawin.

‡ The author is responsible for the fact.

in large places? In a large inland city of New England, several reliable men, some of them having peculiar means of knowledge, have stated to me that most of the members of the Universalist church in that place are more or less in the habit of using profane language; and the intelligent keeper of a restaurateur, though inclined to speak favorably of the Universalist minister there, yet in the same conversation volunteered to my informant (a Baptist minister,) this remark: "Hundreds of young persons are going down to destruction through the influence of Mr. ———," the Universalist preacher.

Would you hear from the duelist the night before he was shot? Hear Jonathan Cilley, Member of Congress from Maine, in conversation with a pious lady, in Washington, the night before he was killed by Graves of Kentucky. "He confessed that, with the religious views that the lady entertained, he should be deterred from fighting the duel. But as a Universalist, he had nothing to fear; if he shot his antagonist, the world would justify him; but if he was killed, his soul would immediately ascend to heaven."\*

Would you hear the testimony of the suicide? Listen to the letter of Cyrus C. Crawford of Plymouth N. H. He was a Universalist and the son of a zealous Universalist. Detected as a counterfeiter, he lay in Lowell jail awaiting his trial, in 1840. He wrote a letter to his mother, saying, "he had got into trouble—trouble for life—and he thought he would get out of it in the shortest way." "He bade his friends farewell till they should meet in an unknown world where

---

\* Un. Exam. p. 325.

parting is not known.”\* And so like a consistent Universalist, who preferred the free range of Paradise to a seven-foot cell with an iron bedstead, he made his leap, as he thought, into heaven.

Would you hear from the suicide nearer home? In the summer of 1854, in the city of Manchester, two young women, under the influence of disappointment, one day dressed themselves in white, plunged into the upper canal, and perished. Those two young women, but a Sabbath or two before, had gone and heard a discourse teaching that all men go to heaven; and in their conversations with a friend of theirs, who stated it to the Rev. J. M. Coburn at the time, they had affirmed that “they should go right to heaven, and it was best to get rid of trouble.”

Now, as a fearful comment on all this, read in the *Trumpet*, where Thomas Whittemore gravely argues, that the punishment of suicide “lies in the intention to commit it” and all takes place beforehand;—and listen to Rev. A. B. Grosh, in the *Magazine & Advocate*, questioning whether suicide even has always an evil intention!†

Now in reply to these cases and the like, I know we shall hear the customary declamation, that men of all religions are guilty of crime. But, I beg you will observe, that has nothing to do with the question: I have cited these sad facts, not in proof that Universal-

---

\* George, p. 391. Smith, p. 324.

† *Trumpet* No. 676; *Mag. and Advo.* Vol. 8, p. 358. Quoted by Rev. N. D. George, p. 318. Hosea Ballou advocates the view that the punishment of suicide takes place at the time and in the act. Whittemore's *Life of Ballou*, Vol. 3.

ists commit crime, but that THEIR UNIVERSALISM *was the actual, direct and avowed encouragement to their crime*. And I have given you facts, and not theories.

Bear in mind that such are the influences of this pernicious system, notwithstanding its limited number of preachers, notwithstanding all the counteracting restraints of the law and of a preached gospel all around;—and you can well agree with a distinguished judge in the Middle States, who replied to the Universalist minister thus: “This, sir, I do believe, that were all clergymen to preach this doctrine that you preach, there would soon be a hell in this world, if not in the next.”

Thus you perceive, my hearers, that this system is consistent with itself from beginning to end. In its nature and its character; in the obvious marks which it wears on its front; in its inner economy of life, its argument—its deceitful method of dealing with God’s word; in its perversion of God’s attributes and its appeal to human, unregenerate passions; and in its actual moral tendencies, the slime that tracks its way;—all is in keeping. Can you wonder that men who understand that system in all its windings, loathe, and abhor, and despise *the system*, however fair may be the standing of many of its adherents. Can you wonder that the Rev. J. B. Finley should call it “the doctrine of devils,” and the Rev. J. M. Palmer should say, “it is worse than Deism?” Can you wonder we feel that when a young man puts himself under the power of that heresy, there is little hope of him for the world to come, and great danger of his ruin in the present life? Or that to its preachers, whatever their personal char-

acter, yet in their *official capacity*, we assign the words of the prophet, "With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life."

And now let me advise the members of my congregation, never to countenance the preaching of that system by your presence. There is nothing to be learned, as you well know. The system, as you are well satisfied, is false. Leave it in its rottenness. I went once to hear it deal with Scripture. I went, however, not from curiosity, but for purposes of use and duty. That duty now is done;—for I have exposed to you the corrupt and corrupting character of the system that denies a future retribution.

Let us live, my hearers, henceforth, in view of the great and awful truth to which our minds have been turned in this discussion. Let us remember habitually, "it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment"—that "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Death rolls on apace; and as death leaves us, the judgment finds us.

Do I speak to some adherent of the system? And shall it be in vain, my friend, that I have shown you the system in a light in which you have not seen it before—its hollowness within—its sophistry and dishonesty—its dangerous and immoral tendencies—the chaotic condition of its very ministry, not daring publicly to avow the sentiments they hold, but ever moving downward and downward, till their infidelity breaks



out of its hiding-place. Shall it be in vain that you look in on their vacillation and discordance? And when these men stand up to be sponsors for God to all eternity—dare you trust your hopes to such blind guides? “If the blind lead the blind,” said the Savior, “both shall fall into the ditch.”

Remember there are times when some of these men are troubled at heart with their own doings. They may, they must, speak boldly abroad, when their souls quail within. It is not in human nature to defy the whole force of God’s word, without fearful misgivings. Within the last six years, there died in Pittsfield, Mass., a rich but very dissolute man,—a Universalist. Just before the funeral, the Rev. Mr. H., a Methodist minister, visiting his brother the Universalist preacher, found him walking his room, apparently in great distress. “What is the trouble,” inquired the Methodist. “Ah,” replied the Universalist, “they want me to put that man into heaven, but he is not there, he is not there!” You will not be surprised to learn that the preacher soon left the Universalist ministry. But why, oh! why did he not tell that profligate that he would not go to heaven, *before he died*?

Oh! what an awful responsibility rests on him who flatters men that they shall surely enter heaven, when every step takes hold on death and hell! And what a meeting in that other world, when the deceiver and his victim—he that recklessly preached, and he that greedily heard, the soul destroying doctrine—shall gaze in each other’s faces, and shall read, written in lines of eternal despair,—“THE UNRIGHTEOUS SHALL NOT INHERIT THE KINGDOM OF GOD!”

## LECTURE SEVENTH.

### RESTORATIONIST VIEWS AMONG UNIVERSALISTS.

Matt. XXV : 46. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment ;  
but the righteous into life eternal.

IN these words does the Lord Jesus Christ describe the duration of human retribution,—everlasting punishment, and life eternal. And my hearers will take notice, that though our English version employs two different words,—“ everlasting ” and “ eternal,”—the term used in the original Greek is in each case precisely the same. It is, moreover, the very same term, which, elsewhere in the New Testament, (Rom. 16 : 26,) describes the duration of God’s own existence, when he is called “ the EVERLASTING GOD.”

The solemn narration, of which this forms the conclusion, sets forth the final judgment. The Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him. He shall sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations ; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. The sheep, his own chosen flock, he sets on his right hand ; he calls them “ ye blessed of my Father.” They are “ the righteous.” They include not merely those who may have known the Savior in person, but the righteous through all time ; for their Christian offices had been rendered, not unto him, but unto “ the least of his brethren.” The

kingdom awaiting the righteous, was “prepared for them before the foundation of the world.” Those whom he sets on his left hand, he calls “ye cursed.” They had not withhelden from Christ in person, but they had refused the offices of piety towards him in the least of his brethren. And, as the home of the righteous was prepared before the foundation of the world, so, we are told, the wicked are commanded to depart “into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels.” “And these shall go away into everlasting or eternal punishment, but the righteous into life everlasting or eternal.” Thus the Lord Jesus Christ, in the same breath, declares the duration of the punishment of the wicked, and of the reward of the righteous, by the very same word,—and that, a word than which there is no stronger in the Greek language to denote the coming eternity of God. Enough, then, that the pains of hell shall be coeval with the happiness of heaven,—and both of them with the ceaseless years of God.

Against this and other plain declarations of God’s word, as we have seen, there is a considerable body of men, who, though pretending to receive the Bible, boldly deny that there shall be any punishment at all after death. Their doctrine I have sufficiently shown to be no obsolete thing, but a living system of the present day, the published doctrine of the Universalist denomination. No different doctrine has for many years been distinctly put forth in the printed volumes of the denomination. So far as can be ascertained, it still holds undisputed possession of the great mass of the Universalist pulpits and periodical literature.

It is the stated spiritual food of the denomination.

There are some in the denomination, however,—the smaller and better portion,—who do not deny all future punishment, but only its eternal continuance. As the latter view is much less glaringly absurd than the former, and is far more respectable in its social position and influence, it is not unusual for those who hold it, to persuade others and perhaps themselves, that it is somewhat prevalent. And it is not an unheard-of thing, for those who do not hold this view, when hard pressed with the low character of their own system, to beat a temporary retreat behind the shelter and the respectability of Restorationism. In order, therefore, to meet the device, I propose, in the present lecture, very briefly to consider the subject of

#### RESTORATIONIST UNIVERSALISM.

To do this satisfactorily, requires that I first sketch the history of the system; after which I will examine its foundation.

I. The history of Restorationist views among Universalists.

John Murray was a Restorationist. So were Winchester and Mitchell; and so were the great body of Universalists until the year 1818, or nearly forty years ago. They believed in punishment after death; but in the final “restoration” of all men, without exception, to endless blessedness. About that time, Hosea Ballou openly announced the theory, which he had held in private, that “beyond this mortal existence, the Bible teaches no other sentient state but that which is called by the blessed name of life and immor-

tality.”\* Mr. Ballou was then editor of the principal Universalist journal, and he used his organ so effectually that he soon carried nearly the whole denomination with him. Many individuals, indeed, opposed his doctrine, complained of his unfairness in excluding them from the use of his journal, and threatened secession. A separation did take place in 1828, when the believers in future punishment organized themselves into a distinct body, called Restorationists. The Restorationist movement, as a separate affair, was unsuccessful. Dr. Baird affirms that “the Restorationist preachers in the United States hardly exceed twelve or fifteen in number, and their churches are even fewer.”†

It is not to be understood, however, that all who held Restorationist views, joined this separate movement. But it is a sad commentary on the character of the adherents of Universalism, that in twelve short years from the time when Ballou first broached his system, the great body of Universalists came over to his views, and but a small minority continued to avow their belief in any future punishment. This is Mr. Whittemore’s own showing. His *Modern History of Universalism* was published in 1830. During the previous year he had written letters to prominent Universalist preachers in different parts of the country, inquiring what proportion of the denomination around them denied all future suffering. He quotes the answers of eleven different persons,‡ residing in seven different states of the Union. In no instance did the

---

\* Whittemore’s *Mod. Hist. of Un.* p. 438. † *Religion in America*, (N. Y., 1856,) p. 565. ‡ *Modern History of Universalism*, pp. 439—441.

writer declare that a majority held to future punishment. And according to the total testimony, the believers in future discipline in the denomination, were both insignificant in number, and quite indifferent upon the subject.\*

From that time onward, the ultra Universalist element seems to have completely occupied the field ; and Restorationism, so far as it has existed in the denomination, has been quite thoroughly muzzled. The standard books and, with faint exceptions, the periodicals, have distinctly taught no different doctrine from that of Ballou and Whittemore, for a quarter of a century.

---

\* The strongest case for Restorationism was given by Rev. W. A. Drew, of Maine, who said, "I should think that a majority of our brethren would *not* affirm positively, as their settled belief, that there will, or will not be punishment hereafter. The other half may be pretty equally divided on the subject." "Of the ministers, five are open disbelievers of any future punishment ; eight profess to believe it, but most of them do not seem to be strenuous about it: and the remainder are studiously silent on the subject."

Rev. S. R. Smith, of Clinton, N. Y., after giving it as his opinion that believers in future punishment are "not as numerous as those who reject the doctrine," adds that "this is a subject on which very little interest is felt, and is seldom agitated by the preachers."

Rev. A. B. Grosh, then of Lancaster Co., Pa., thought that not more than a fifteenth or twentieth part of the denomination around him believed in any future punishment.

Alexander McRae, editor of the *Liberalist*, in Wilmington, N. C., writes: "Universalists in this state, with but few exceptions, believe in no punishment after death."

Rev. J. Kidwell, a travelling preacher in Ohio and Indiana, says: "There is but one preacher within my acquaintance, calling himself a Universalist, who believes in any future punishment, and there are but few private individuals."

Rev. J. C. Waldo of Cincinnati, says that he learns from a Mr. R. who is thoroughly acquainted in every section of this country, that "the Restorationists are comparatively nothing."



A good illustration of the state of things, is found in the case of Rev. Russell Streeter. It seems that in the year 1844, he wrote, in the Universalist Watchman, a series of letters "to a Young Minister," in which he objected to the views of Ballou, and contended for future accountability. The Gospel Banner of Nov. 1844, commenting upon the fact, says, "He is a Restorationist, and always has been. The number of such in the denomination is not small, but their desire for the peace of the order has caused them to be more careful than some of different views have been, as to committing the order to their opinions." Now I have in my possession a work by this same Russell Streeter, entitled, "Familiar Conversations, in which the salvation of all mankind *is clearly exhibited and illustrated.*" The edition which I have was printed in the same year, 1844; but so careful was this Restorationist not to commit the denomination to his opinions, that I have looked through it in vain to find an intimation of his peculiar views. And (on page 76) he distinctly "denies that there is any difference which deserves to be called essential," among Universalists. In 1849, as you remember, Mr. Ballou asserted, "Though there are some now who believe in what is called future retribution, we know of none who pretend to prove it by Divine revelation, or dwell upon it in their preaching." The experience of Rev. Mr. George will also be remembered, who, within a few months, inquired in vain at the Universalist book-store in Boston, for any volume issued by the denomination, teaching future retribution; and sought in vain for the doctrine in their catechisms.

Still it has been supposed by some, that within a

very few years, (some four or six,) Restorationist views have been reviving in the denomination. It may be true that some leading men are desirous to rise from the deep degradation of bald Universalism. If so, they are feeling their way cautiously, and, thus far, can show no land-marks of their progress. There have always been Restorationists in the Universalist ministry, but they have commonly held their places on condition of holding their peace. For respectability's sake, many of the ministry might wish to teach some future punishment; but the motley group that compose their congregations, will not endure it, and they dare not preach it. Since, however, the majority of the American Unitarian Association have avowed their belief in the final Restoration of all men, probably many Universalists have been encouraged with the hope of becoming connected with a denomination which occupies a much more genteel position in society; and have been emboldened by their support to look favorably on the long-proscribed doctrine. And there have even been a few, a very few, instances of interchange and union between the churches of the two denominations.

Entirely incredulous of any essentially different state of things, in the denomination at large, from that to which Mr. Ballou testified seven years ago, and which Mr. George ascertained a few months since, I determined to go to head-quarters for information. Accordingly, since my previous lectures were delivered, I wrote to three prominent members of the denomination, who, as I supposed, held the Restorationist view; Rev. E. H. Chapin of New York, Rev. T. Starr King of Boston, and Rev. Eli Ballou of Montpelier, editor of the Chris-

tian Repository. I asked them if they would refer me to some book or treatise, that advocates the views of the Restorationists. Mr. Ballou first replied to my inquiry ; and in a very courteous note, dated Sept. 25, 1856, he mentions three books which teach that doctrine, viz : Winchester's Dialogues, Petitpierre on the Divine Goodness, and T. Southwood Smith on the Divine Government. In a postscript, he adds that he presumes these books are "out of print," but probably they could be found and borrowed. Do you ask, when were these books written ? The first was published in 1788, sixty-eight years ago ; the second in 1786, or seventy years ago ; and the third in 1816, forty years ago. He was right in his conjecture that they were out of print ; I have sent in vain to New York and Boston to procure a copy of the latest and ablest of the three, written by a man who afterwards turned infidel.—In his postscript, Mr. Ballou adds "R. Streeter's Conversations" to the list ; but I have examined that volume, and do not find the doctrine there. He also mentions that he encloses me a copy of his paper containing his views, and an article from the Ambassador. But the paper has, for some reason, failed to reach me. These are all the references which he could give me. Now in view of these facts, when in the course of his letter he expresses the opinion that "probably *most* of the preachers of the Universalist Denomination hold the doctrine of future discipline," I certainly think he has given a very singular proof of his opinion. A very odd denomination this, in which "*most*" of the preachers hold a doctrine, the principal volumes in defence of which were written from forty to seventy years ago,

and which are now *out of print and out of the market*; while for years the market has been, and now is, flooded with works denying the doctrine which “most” of these preachers hold,—and yet selling, edition after edition.\* A very singular denomination! While therefore I would speak respectfully of Mr. Ballou, I must correct his opinion by his facts.

From Rev. T. S. King, also, I received a highly courteous reply, dated Sept. 29, 1856. He referred me in general for “strong presentations of the argument for Universal Salvation,” to the collected works of Rev. Hosea Ballou, and Rev. I. D. Williamson, both of them deniers of future punishment!† He said, however, that if I was inquiring for the *Restorationist* doctrine distinctly, he did not at present recall any single work in its defence, but that treatises bearing on it might be found in the Universalist Quarterly Review. In regard to that Review I will speak presently. This is all the information Mr. King could give me.‡

Mr. Chapin never replied to my inquiry. But not long afterwards, being in New York, I went to the Universalist Book-store, kept at the entrance of his church, and inquired for Restorationist books. The clerk, in response, pulled out from a miscellaneous

---

\* The *seventh* edition of Cobb's Compend was published in 1854; the third and stereotype edition of Ballou's Lecture Sermons, in 1854; Whittemore's Plain Guide had sold in 1851, to the number of 10,000 or 12,000; and so on. These books there is no difficulty in finding now.

† Mr. Williamson at times seems inconsistent with himself.

‡ The information sought and obtained in these letters, it will be perceived, was entirely of a general and public nature—the existence of certain books and treatises. I wish to speak of these gentlemen, also, with entire respect—though strangers to me personally.

pile of dingy pamphlets, a treatise purporting to have been written by Jeremy White, chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, and published (after his death,) in the year 1707, one hundred and forty nine years ago ! “ But have you nothing else ? ” “ Nothing,” was the answer ; and I thought I could understand why I never received a reply from Mr. Chapin, to my inquiry.

Foiled thus to get on track of Restorationism, I followed Mr. King’s suggestion and turned to the Quarterly Review. I examined all the numbers of that periodical for the years 1855 and 1856, without finding article or paragraph, that distinctly advocates punishment beyond the grave. The moral tone of the periodical is higher than that of Whittemore or Ballou, but during these two years it contains no Restorationism. Without exploring further, I turned back to the Number for January, 1853, which, I had been told, contained a noted article, by Mr. King advocating this view. And in an article of fifteen pages on the theme “ What must I do to be saved ? ”—I find two, or most three, sentences which somewhat distinctly avow the opinion that the consequences of men’s actions may follow them into eternity. Two of these sentences, however, are encumbered with a “ perhaps.” The third sentence reads thus : “ Heaven and hell are differences of degrees ; Eternity is the onward sweep and development of the life of time.”

The same number of the Review contains an article by Hosea Ballou, 2nd, on the “ Condition of men after death.” And it affords an instructive insight into the state of the denomination, to find three-fourths of his article devoted to combatting three notions concerning

the future state:—first that it is attended with a loss of personal existence or self-consciousness—a kind of absorption or virtual annihilation; second, that it is accompanied by a loss of all knowledge of our former selves—a virtual annihilation and re-creation; third, that it is introduced by a “suspension of existence for thousands of years.” Having settled these questions in the negative, he at last advances timidly to that “*eye-sore of a question*, whether the experience and character of the present life will have any effect on us after death.” With great caution and circumspection, he maintains the affirmative. He even cites scripture to show that good men will feel the effect of their self-denying lives; and two passages to show, that “the consequences of a disobedient and impenitent life *seem* also to be traced into the future state.” One of these refers to the “spirits in prison,” who, “it was the thought of St. Peter,” continued under “*disadvantage*” from the time of Noah to the time of Christ. Mr. Ballou amply apologizes for touching this “eye-sore,” by informing us (on p. 48,) that if we keep “the profounder sentiments unimpaired in which so much of the vitality of our [Universalist] faith lies, it is comparatively of little consequence how we decide the question of temporary rewards or punishments hereafter;” and also (on p. 51) that it does not seem to him “a subject of primary importance.”\*

Though for the last two years, at least, the Review has mended its manners, and scrupulously refrained

---

\* On page 7 of these lectures, the editor of the Quarterly is inadvertently spoken of, as advocating no future punishment. I wish here to make the correction.



from disturbing the "*eye-sore*," we are told by the Rev. A. B. Grosh, that "thus far it has not paid its way."\*

The truth is, whatever a few leading ministers may desire for respectability's sake, or from conviction, the mass of the denomination will not hear of any future punishment. It is not the thing they pay the preacher for; it is not in the contract. They want "smooth things," and smooth things they will have. More than one Restorationist minister, it is well known, has kept his place by keeping silent on his belief. The people "cared not what he believed," if he did not preach future punishment. And should the Universalist ministry, as a body, go over to Restorationism, and openly urge their doctrine, they will simply leave their places; the denomination will never follow them. A few Unitarian pulpits may be opened before the more educated of them;—and the Universalist pulpits will be shut behind them. The mighty gravitation, which in twelve short years dragged the whole sect down from the plane of Restorationism into the abyss of Universalism, will hold it where it fell. It contains elements that no human power can raise. The mass of its congregations will never hear of any punishment beyond the grave, whether from an orthodox or a Universalist preacher. A significant reply was given in this vicinity, not many months ago. A member of a Universalist Congregation stoutly maintained that the preacher whom he had heard for years, did not believe in any future punishment. Being informed a few days after, that his preacher, under an emergency, had expressed

---

\* Un. Comp. for 1857, p. 34.

or seemed to express Restorationist views—"Well, if *he* believes in future punishment, *I* don't," was the brief and significant reply. And whatever may be the transient resort of emergencies, doubtless that preacher will never venture habitually and earnestly to press upon the men who compose his congregation, the consequences of their present lives in another world, as a divine teaching, and a theme of momentous practical concern,—until his mind is fully prepared for another field of labor than the Universalist pulpit. The demand for Ultra-Universalism will never cease till man's opposition to God's law ceases; and the demand will create a supply.

Notwithstanding the scarcity and timidity of Restorationist views in the Universalist denomination, the discussion of the subject will not be complete, without some examination of

II. The foundation of the system. The Restorationist scheme, as now held in the Universalist sect, maintains that all suffering is inflicted for the good of the individual sinner,—that it is solely for discipline and reformation; that this suffering will in many cases extend an unknown period into the other world, but will in all cases bring the sinner to holiness and happiness. On this particular scheme—remedial and temporary punishment or suffering beyond the grave,—I remark,

1. The doctrine depends and must depend chiefly on other grounds than Scripture declarations. It is essentially extra-scriptural. It does not, and it cannot, venture to meddle much with those texts that speak specifically of the condition of men beyond the grave. If they are allowed to teach anything, they teach

a great deal too much for Restorationism. Either of two courses might be adopted with them.—They may be taken in their full meaning and future reference ; or their future reference may be recklessly denied. It is difficult to take a half-way position, admitting the reference to future punishment, and then restricting their meaning. The humble Christian takes them as they are ; the ultra-Universalist makes a clean sweep of everything. He denies that eternal life, or the kingdom of heaven, or the judgment, ever refer to another world. “Eternal” and “forever,” not only do not denote eternity,—they do not even enter eternity, they do not pass out of this world. He makes thorough work, by denying all rewards, as well as punishments, hereafter. For he saw that if the terrible tide of retribution were once suffered to flow in another world, it might flow on,—and “forever” might be indeed forever. He saw that when he began to amputate the word of God, he might far better cut it clean off at the trunk. Hosea Ballou well expressed the dilemma, when he said,—“We know of no passages of Scripture, which imply the existence of either sin or punishment in the future state. Could we find any such testimony, we should then need Scripture proof that such sin and punishment will have an end, in order to be consistent Universalists.” In truth, it was only by boldly carrying out the principles on which the earlier Restorationists restrained the Scriptures, that the whole denomination sunk in a dozen years into low Universalism. So untenable is that middle position, on Scripture grounds, that Mr. Ballou, as we are informed in his Life by Whittemore,

was for years in the habit of challenging any one to produce a passage that taught any punishment hereafter. He probably was confident that he could push the Restorationist, by his own principles, from his position. He must go farther, or not so far. He must deny that *any* future punishment, or admit that *eternal* punishment is taught in the Scriptures;—or he must let the Scriptures alone. For the Scriptures do not speak of semi-eternal punishment.

Modern Restorationists seem to have learned the lesson. They make little appeal to the Bible in support of their peculiar tenets. Those who constituted the majority of the American Unitarian Association in 1853, distinctly admit, “It is our firm conviction that the final restoration of all *is not revealed in the Scriptures*, but that the ultimate fate of the impenitent wicked is left shrouded in impenetrable obscurity, so far as the total declarations of the sacred writers are concerned; the doctrine of the final restoration of the wicked is, with them, “a consistent speculation of the reason and a strong belief of the heart.” They therefore say that they “cannot emphasize it in the foreground of their preaching as a sure part of Christianity, but only elevate it in the back-ground of their system, as a glorious hope which seems to them a warranted inference from the cardinal principles of Christianity as well as from the great verities of moral science.”

The theory of Rev. T. S. King, as exhibited in his article on “What must I do to be saved,” seems in its essential features to be nearly as independent of Scripture authority, as was the system of Plato. He teaches that salvation is not rescue from an outward danger,

nor the purchase of an inheritance; it is only a spiritual state. Our characters constitute our heaven or our salvation. There is no hell but evil, no heaven but goodness. Our redemption is internal; we get the heaven we earn, only what we earn, and just as much as we earn. And all which the mercy of God can do in the case is to furnish the opportunity and means for our own culture. The path of vice is a gradual descending slope into spiritual degradation and death—a slope, the inclination of which depends on the human will, and which perhaps keeps the same angle into eternity. The path of virtue does not open into a paradise of rewards; a man's holiness is his heaven and his salvation here; and the holiness he carries with him through the tomb, gives him rank and constitutes his salvation at the commencement of his future career. When therefore a man seriously asks himself—‘What must I do to be saved?’ the true answer will be, conquer your most seductive temptations, wrestle steadily against your principal weakness, bring up the level of your life by stopping the peculiar outlet through which your virtue leaks away; fortify your character on the side of your prevailing poverty and need.\* Such, in his own language somewhat condensed, is the substance of this brilliant writer's noted article. And though garnished, here and there with a Scripture phrase, by way of decoration, can a scheme of more unmitigated Deism anywhere be found? What one tenet of superhuman origin has the system? Let us accord all credit to the system for the strenuousness

---

\* Univ. Quar. Rev., Jan. 1853.



with which it insists on virtue; but if there be one feature in it, for which it is more dependant on Scripture authority than was the system of Plato, we would be glad to know what it is. This, however, is the most attenuated form of Restorationism.

Hosea Ballou, 2nd, though inclined more to Scripture authority, is manifestly wary of adducing texts concerning "future discipline." He cautiously cites two or three passages which "seem" to him to imply that good men reap some benefit hereafter from their labors and self-denials here; and two only, by which "the consequences of a disobedient and impenitent life *seem* to be traced into the future state." One of these latter passages is that concerning "the spirits in prison," 1 Peter 3: 18—20; the other, 2 Cor. 5: 8—10, containing these words: "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." He does not venture to quote a passage that indicates the length of future punishment; but dispatches the whole subject thus: "Other texts might be quoted in point, did it seem to us a subject of primary importance."\*

And doubtless the advocates of Restorationism will henceforth be, as they now are, wary of citing Scripture texts. For when the Scriptures are once permitted to speak on the subject of future punishment, it is difficult to arrest their fearful tide of testimony. I proceed, then, to remark that

---

\* Id. pp. 48—51. The reader will see why no attempt is made to deal with the books of Winchester, Petitpierre and Southwood Smith.—Their present authority would be at once denied, as it was by Whittemore twenty-five years ago. See George on Un. p. 380.



2. The doctrine is involved in insuperable difficulties, even upon principles of reason and facts of Providence.

It asserts two things : that all the suffering of the sinner is but a discipline for his good ; and that it will surely result in his perfect holiness and happiness.—Were not the Bible in the way, neither of these points could be sustained by evidence.

The statement that all punishment is only for the individual good of the offender, is a gratuitous assumption. And not only so ; it is false both to the intuitive moral conviction of man, and the clear course of God's Providential government. Our moral conviction that sin deserves punishment, has no respect whatever to the welfare of the offender. God has so made us that when we see crime, or are guilty of it, our conscience says it deserves punishment ; if it be atrocious crime, that decision is vehement and indignant—it stirs a whole community. It looks not first even to the welfare of society—it looks not to the offender's reformation. It fixes its gaze on the nature of the crime, the demerit of the act, and says, “ it ought to be punished.” So far is that sense of ill-desert from regarding the offender's happiness, it declares that his happiness ought to be diminished. We may labor to recover him from sin, that he may incur no more ill-desert ; but the spontaneous judgment of the moral sense is that, aside from all ulterior considerations, guilt deserves punishment. The offender's good has nothing to do with that judgment.

The providence of God repudiates the principle. His obedient children are indeed blessed by afflictions. But it is notoriously otherwise with the great mass of

vile men, through this whole life. Except where the peculiar reformatory influences of Christ's gospel are brought to bear, suffering makes men worse. The more miserable, the more malignant and reckless and sinful. What countless multitudes of cases could be cited, in which men and women have sunk lower and lower in ferocious and desperate sin, even as the penalty of their sins came gathering heavily upon them, until life went out in utter moral darkness. God does send on men a vast amount of suffering, which manifestly does them no good whatever. And how many unprincipled men are there in every community, now held to respectability by their outward connexions of comfort and enjoyment, whom, were they stripped to-day of wealth and health and friends and position and pleasure, and all outward respect and hope, you would see to-morrow give themselves up to all iniquity.

And yet, this is a world of grace and hope. Even in this life of hope, of *partial* hardening, and of better influences, suffering proves reformatory, in general, only to less hardened souls. As men grow bold in sin, suffering itself commonly serves but to develope new and more appalling forms of guilt; especially so, when they are given up to each other's society, and respect itself is gone.

While, therefore, this doctrine, in its principle, is not sustained by the native moral convictions, as a theory of events, it is contradicted by the facts of this life.

But the difficulties are not exhausted; they increase as we look beyond this world. Where shall these impenitent wicked find their society, in order to reform?

Certainly not with the children of God ; that would mar heaven. It must then be with each other. A strange reformatory scene ! The place where all the most awful criminals that the world has seen in all ages of history, and where only those who are outcasts from holiness and God are gathered together,—God's great state's-prison, without either chapel or chaplain, where no holy society nor holy influence ever enters,—is assuredly the last place in all God's universe to send men for repentance,—men who, when less guilty, and surrounded with every good influence, and every help and hope, yet resisted the calls of Christ ! The knowledge of human nature in deep guilt and desperate emergencies, and in the worst of all society, casts no shadow of light, nothing but deep gloom, on the prospects of lost men ; it gives all probability to that fearful Scripture, " they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven." When all the appliances of a world of probation, of hope, of Christian society, of spiritual help, of comparative ease of mind, prove unavailing,—what, alas, is to be expected from the companionship of devils, from the withdrawal of God's spirit, from incessant remorse, from loss of earthly restraints and mutual respect,—from despair ? Surely, until the devil and his angels are fit guides to holiness, and until ages of cursing and blasphemy tend to train the soul for angelic praises, hell is no place to prepare for heaven ! And Ballou himself makes a fatal admission, when he grants in regard to the " spirits in prison," who had been disobedient in the time of Noah, that " the disadvantage *under which they continued down to the time of Christ*, was occasioned by their former

obstinacy.”\* For if not one hundred nor two hundred years alone, but twenty-three long weary centuries could roll away in suffering and sin as the fruit of that “former obstinacy,” what becomes of the boasted reformatory power of suffering? what of the appeal to God’s mercy? And what shall prevent other ages on ages rolling by, and leaving them still in sin and woe?—For the Scripture says not one word of their repentance.†

But the difficulties are not ended. If their former obstinacy occasioned a “disadvantage” of at least twenty-three hundred years, what of all their subsequent obstinacy? Does that go for nothing? or does God visit that also with “disadvantages?” And at that rate when will their sufferings have an end?—They have been going on in sin. God left them to go on. It was therefore not unjust in him to suffer it, nor is it unjust in him to punish it. Indeed, we might

---

\* Univ. Quarterly Rev. Jan. 1853, p. 49. Mr. Ballou is editor of the Review, and President of Tufts’ College.

† Mr. Ballou would probably imply that “the spirits in prison” were liberated in the time of Christ. But God’s word says no such thing. He also holds, as I suppose, that Christ preached to them while they were in prison. But the intelligent reader of Scripture will observe that the apostle says that “*by the spirit*” Christ preached to them,—that they are described as disobedient “in the days of Noah,”—and that the same apostle (in 2 Pet. 2 : 5,) speaks of Noah as “a preacher of righteousness.” Putting these things together, we have this natural and Scriptural explanation: Christ, by the spirit, and through the instrumentality of Noah, preached to the spirits *now* in prison, while “the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.” So Paul said, “As though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.” To take for granted that the preaching was in their prison, much more, that it delivered them from prison, is a naked assumption without evidence.

put the whole case of endless punishment on this simple ground: "If God may without injury permit a creature to fall into sin to-day, and punish him for it, why may he not do the same to-morrow, and so on through every day or period of his existence?"\* And the God who could deliberately permit that sinning and suffering to revolve its wretched round during that vast period from the days of Noah until Christ, from hundreds of years before the period of authentic history, while empires on earth were rising and falling, and the earth itself was growing old,—is it at all incredible that the same God should suffer it to continue down beyond the range of all earthly history, when these empires and the earth itself have passed away? May he not make good his word? and is there not a terrific probability that "everlasting punishment" may be everlasting? When once the beginning of future punishment is conceded, there rests on those who encourage the sinner with the hope of its termination, a mighty responsibility to prove their assertion by most indubitable evidence. And when they once admit that punishment continues generation after generation, century after century, and chiliad after chiliad, is not the prospect dark as midnight, that it may go on forever and forever?

Indeed, the doctrine of limited future punishment for discipline, so far from clearing up the mercy of God, only embarrasses the case. It supposes a needless and wanton severity. If there be actual *wrong* in sin, calling for vengeance, if the claims of a violated law

---

\* Edwards on the Salvation of All Men.



of ineffable value, and the offended dignity of an insulted God, *justly* demand fearful and endless woes,—we can at least comprehend the case. Those sufferings are a doom. They roll on because they are forever to roll on. All is in keeping. It is not mercy: it is justice, holding on the even tenor of its way. But that mere mercy, with resources such as could arrest Mary Magdalene and Saul of Tarsus, in a moment, should yet deliberately choose to inflict ages and ages of suffering, to bring to repentance those whom it might at once have delivered, is, according to the first principles of Restorationism, inexplicable and inconsistent. Those sufferings are inflicted without necessity and without justification, unless they are inflicted for some other end than the sinner's reformation—they are a wanton exercise of cruelty. For, that repentance might have been secured at a much less fearful rate. And if the Restorationist deny that mercy could save the sinner, except by the discipline of ages, let him see to it lest he deny God's power to save him at all.

There are other formidable difficulties attendant on this scheme. But I omit them, that I may proceed directly to show that

3. The system is totally overthrown by the word of God.

The fundamental position that all punishment, or rather suffering, (for the system repudiates all proper punishment,) is designed simply for the offender's good, is not only unsupported by Scripture; it is at open war with its spirit and its speech. The Bible makes a broad distinction between the sufferings sent upon the believer, and those upon the ungodly. The one is visited



with "correction" and "chastisement" mingled with "pity," and for his "good;" the other is threatened with "wrath," "fury," "vengeance," "judgment without mercy." The one class is called "blessed" under their sufferings,—“Blessed is the man whom thou chastenest, O Lord;” the other class is called "accursed" in their pains,—“depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire.” The Scripture distinction is as broad and plain as words can make it. But this doctrine would confound the whole difference of sentiment and language. According to its teaching, “God’s raining upon the wicked ‘snares, fire and brimstone,’ is synonymous with sending upon them sanctifying mercies! The threatenings against the ungodly, of ‘indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish,’ refers to the distribution of various sorts of blessings! The Scripture expression, ‘fierce wrath of God,’ must mean simply, fierce *goodness* of God. And the ‘fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries,’ is the same as fiery *mercy* which shall *save* the adversaries!” Away with such abuse of speech! All the utterances of God’s word toward the pertinaciously wicked, are in conflict with the first principles of the system. It finds no support in the Bible except by misappropriating God’s promises to his saints.

That this punishment beyond the grave shall result in the purification of the wicked, any more than it has effected that of the devil and his angels, with whom their lot is cast; or that their punishment shall ever have an end;—of this, not a distinct intimation is brought or attempted, from the Bible. The most that is done is to appeal to God’s attributes, and cite a few

passages to show in general that all men will be saved; and both of these attempts we have seen to be fallacious. Not a text can be cited, that intimates either the purifying power or the termination of that admitted suffering. And the Restorationist is in that dilemma, on which Ballou the elder gave them warning, of conceding the fact of future punishment from the Bible, and then needing scripture proof of its termination;—but, alas, without finding that scripture proof.

The Bible gives no hint of the existence of *probation* beyond the present life; but much the contrary. When we appear before the judgment seat of Christ, we are to “receive the things done in the body.” Into this world, Christ came with the offers of life. *Here* men are called on to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and they shall be saved. It is here that by “patient continuance in well-doing,” men are to gain “eternal life;” and they who are “faithful unto death” shall receive “a crown of life;” here the wicked “treasure up wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God.” The preaching of the gospel on earth, becomes “a savor of life unto life,” and “a savor of death unto death.” After death is the judgment. “Fear him, who after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him.” In this life, in this life only, does God’s word locate the probationary state of man.

The Bible neither proposes nor intimates any means of *deliverance* from the doom of the lost. By continual implication and by open declaration, it denies all remedy. “How shall we escape,” is the swelling burden of its admonitions, “how shall we escape, if we

neglect so great salvation?" "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" "Lord, are there few that be saved?" said one to the great Redeemer. "Strive to enter in at the strait gate," was his solemn reply, "for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in and shall not be able." And he warned him of the time "when once the master of the house hath risen up and shut to the door," and all knocking shall be vain. "Let us therefore fear," echoes the apostle, "lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. Let us therefore labor to enter in to that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." He tells us of those to whom "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries." And he adds, "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

Indeed, a Divine and awful sense of the irretrievableness of human destruction but for the death of Christ, and of the sinner's remediless ruin, unless he in this life by faith lay hold on Christ, seems to flow like a rushing stream through the word of God,—and to enfold the whole plan of redemption like a vast atmosphere of gloom into which light breaks only from the cross. It gives meaning to Christ's mission, potency to God's warnings and urgency to the gospel invitations. It can no more be dissipated by dealing with individual passages, than the gloom of midnight can be scattered from the whole heavens by the glimmer of farthing candles. It heaves the heart of the sacred writer; and he exclaims, "knowing therefore the terror of the

Lord, we persuade men." It is that *remediless* ruin, which gives priceless value to the gospel, and depth of meaning to "the unsearchable riches of Christ."

But the Bible is not only burdened in general with the awful sense of human danger; it speaks in articulate terms of the hopeless destruction of the sinner. And it should not be forgotten, that when Christ and his apostles spoke to the Jews of any punishment hereafter, it would not have been necessary for them to declare its eternity. That was conceded by their hearers; no other idea could enter their minds. The Pharisees held to endless punishment; even Whittemore affirms they "are well known to have believed in it.\* For Christ and his apostles, therefore, to assert future punishment, though they had said nothing of its duration, would have been equivalent to declaring its eternity. It could have been understood in no other way.

But they did not leave the matter so. In a great variety of ways they taught that punishment would never end. They taught so plainly as not only to make that impression on the minds of Christians, for the past 1800 years; the infidel also finds it plainly there. "All skeptics," says Asher Moore, the Universalist, "suppose the Bible to teach the doctrine of *endless* misery." How can they help supposing so? For the Scriptures speak in many and varied forms. They describe it by the various positive terms, eternal, everlasting, forever, forever and ever; the very same and only terms that denote the duration of heavenly blessedness—sometimes in the same connection and the

---

\* Plain Guide, p. 43.

same sentence ; the very terms employed, and the strongest that the Greek language furnishes, to describe the extent of God's existence. They declare it in negative forms that deny all termination : "He will burn the chaff with unquenchable fire ;"—"cast into hell where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched ;" "it shall not be forgiven unto men neither in this world nor in the world to come." They state it both negatively and positively in the same sentence ; "hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation ;"—"shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him ;" "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." They describe it as a final exclusion from heaven : "The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God ;" "whither I go, ye cannot come." They describe it as an irreversible doom : "the door is shut," and they that knock without hear the voice, "I know you not ;" "whose *end* is destruction." It is the cessation of all enjoyment, with an impassable barrier between the sinner and heaven : "Son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things and likewise Lazarus evil things ; but now he is comforted and thou art tormented. And besides between you and us there is a great gulf fixed . . . neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." It is a doom so dreadful, as to make existence itself a curse : "it had been good for that man if he had not been born ;"—and yet, had a final eternity of bliss been before him, even though he should first suffer for millions of years, it had been an infinite benefit to be born.

The Bible declares these things, not alone by passing and incidental reference, but also of set design and special aim. In the solemn passage from which my text is taken, the single theme of Christ was to set forth the final retribution; and here he declares the reward of the righteous and the doom of the wicked to be alike eternal. A similar directness of aim and an appalling force of reiteration, is found in Mark 9: 43. "If thy hand offend [ensnare] thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than, having two feet, to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than, having two eyes, to be cast into hell-fire; where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." Here the eternity of future punishment is set forth in terms that admit no evasion. "Our Lord's argument here turns upon the infinite disparity between the temporal and eternal pains. Duration is the only point to be illustrated. And finite is here set in contrast with infinite duration. And this infinite duration is expressed by a variety of epithets, which are, of all others, the most plain, determinate and unexceptionable."\* It dieth not, it is not quenched, it is unquenchable, and (as

---

\* Emerson's Works.



given in Matthew) it is “everlasting.” Ponder now the speaker’s point,—this accumulation of terms, and the emphasis of his threefold repetition; consider the mode in which his hearers from their previous belief were sure to understand him:—and if our Lord did not mean to be understood to affirm the absolute eternity of future punishment, in the name of common sense and common honesty, let me ask, what did he mean?

Here I suspend the argument from Scripture, not because it is exhausted, but because this is enough.—One objection, I wish, in closing, to meet. It has been said that *eternal* punishment is unnecessary. To this it has been often and well replied, that is for God to say, and not for us. We are no judges. The necessities of a government reaching through immensity and eternity, is beyond our scope. God’s own rights and dignity, the actual enormity of sin, the exigencies of the universe, may render it alike incompatible with justice and benevolence in the GREAT MAGISTRATE of such an empire, ever to restore his prisoners. The quiet of the universe, the full exhibition of his own character and the power of his government, the right and adequate impression on all his creatures, the eternal holiness of the holy, may be concerned. Is God so uncompromisingly holy, and does he hate sin with such a hatred, as he declares? Is revolt against his authority, guilt of damning dye? Yea, is he a God of truth, and will he fulfill the threats he has made?—“Can he reign over fallen creatures gloriously to himself?” Or can the powers of darkness break up the essential perfection of his eternal schemes?—These and

others are momentous questions, for which the answers may be found only in the irreversible, endless infliction of the penalty of his law.

But I go further. Does not the very necessity for such an argument as this—does not the utter defiance of the Universalist position, show positive necessity for the never-ending display of God's chastising power? The very rights of his throne are contested, and probably will be contested to all eternity—his right to fulfill his word and execute the penalty of the law. Here are multitudes of men on earth, denying his right to govern his universe as he has declared he will govern it; some of them contending desperately and even ferociously against the penalty which Christ asserted, declaring it “the utmost malignity,”\* “infinite malignity,”† “the most horrid cruelty,”‡ “unmingled and unmitigated cruelty, red as blood and black as hell, without one redeeming ray of pity, mercy, or justice;”§ and even plainly intimating that the Being who could fulfill it, must be a bloody Nero,|| a tyrant, a monster,¶ and an arch-fiend.\*\* They live, they die, they enter eternity, in this state of relentless hostility to the rights and claims and declarations of God. Doubtless Satan and his angels, too, deny that right, and stand in eternal collision with this fundamental principle of God's government. Such being the case, may it not be the only alternative left even to God himself, eternally to assert that right by eternally stretching forth his hand to chasten that desperate rebellion,—that

---

\* Whittemore. † Cobb. ‡ Thomas. § Williamson's Exposition, p. 102. || *Ib.* End. Pun. Ex. p. 57. ¶ *Univ. Quar. Rev.*, Jan. 1855, p. 83.

\*\* *Ib.*, Oct. 1856, p. 333.

relentless war upon the authority of his throne! It is a sad and awful thought.

My task is ended. I have endeavored succinctly to set forth the baselessness of Universalism. In so doing, it has been my duty to exhibit the doom that awaits every soul not found in Christ. It is not my doctrine. I did not make it. I am not responsible for it. I cannot unmake it if I would. The doctrine of eternal punishment is God's doctrine: He takes the responsibility now—he will take the responsibility in the day of judgment. Men may reject it; but it is in God's word. And since it is there, it is neither mercy nor wisdom to hide the truth. It is not your doctrine. You cannot destroy it if you would. Your resistance and denial can make no difference with THE FACT,—but it may make an eternal and fatal difference in your prospects.

But oh! why should you resist it? It cannot harm you, if your heart rests on Christ Jesus for salvation; for neither life nor death, nor things present nor things to come, shall then be able to separate you from the love of God in Jesus Christ our Lord. You need not forever perish. Oh! why should you spend your strength in foolish and fatal struggles against the irresistible ordinance of God, instead of fleeing with all your might to the arms of Christ the Savior? Should you take up your final abode in that home of eternal sorrows, it will not be because the door of heaven was shut against you, nor because you were not warned to flee from the wrath to come, nor because long years were not given you here, in which to make your peace

with God. Lo, the voice comes from heaven, "Live, for I have found a ransom—turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die." And while I utter the message of woe from God, the voice of Christ himself seems to break on my ear,—“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” “And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.” Soon you will be brought face to face with the tremendous issues of eternity. Oh! spend not your fleeting strength in wrangling against the holy bar of God, but in hastening to the Cross of Christ!

THE END.

### ERRATA.

- On page 7, line 17, strike out the words, “The Universalist Quarterly Review.”
- On page 13, line 28, strike out the words in parenthesis after “Banner.”
- On page 176, line 17, change “destruction” to *destination*.
- “ “ 227, last line of text, change “chasten” to *chastise*.
- “ “ 229, last line but one, change “bar” to *law*.















From collection of  
Sept 10 - 70 L





